



# Concordia Theological Monthly



M A Y

•

1 9 5 1

# Concordia Theological Monthly

*Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod*

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of  
the Managing Editor, F.E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

PAUL M. BRETSCHER, RICHARD R. CAEMMERER,  
THEODORE HOYER, FREDERICK E. MAYER, LOUIS J. SIECK

## CONTENTS

	FOR MAY 1951	PAGE
CHURCH AND CHURCH HISTORY IN THE CONFESSIONS.		
<i>Jaroslav Pelikan</i>		305
THE PRINCIPIUM COGNOSCENDI OF ROMAN CATHOLIC THEOLOGY.		
<i>F. E. Mayer</i>		321
NEW TESTAMENT FELLOWSHIP: A STUDY IN SEMANTICS.		
<i>R. T. Du Brau</i>		334
SERMON STUDY ON ISAIAH 12 FOR THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.		
<i>Frederick A. Baepler</i>		351
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER		352
BOOK REVIEW		377

*Berry, George Ricker: The New Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament. — Harper and Brothers, publisher: The Analytical Greek Lexicon. — Verkuyll, Gerrit: Berkeley Version of the New Testament from the Original Greek Version with Brief Footnotes. — Erdman, Charles R.: Your Bible and You. — Warfield, Benjamin B.: The Lord of Glory. — Hirsch, Emanuel: Geschichte der Neuern Evangelischen Theologie. — Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr.: Positive Protestantism. — Hermann, Rudolf: Fragen um den Begriff der Natuerlichen Theologie. — Caillier, Emile, and Blankenagel, John C., translators: Great Shorter Works of Pascal. — Schwartzkopf, Louis J.: The Lutheran Trail. — Dewar, Lindsay: An Outline of New Testament Ethics. — Miller, John Homer: Take a Second Look at Yourself. — Scherzer, Carl J.: The Church and Healing. — Elbin, Paul N.: Fifty Devotional Services. — Applegarth, Margaret T.: Right Here, Right Now.*

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

od

of  
Mo.

ECK

AGE

305

321

334

351

352

377

—

Ger-

sion

field,

uern

—

—

s of

An

ook

N.:

low.

ning

ence

—

—

for

917,

S. L.





# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

VOL. XXII

MAY 1951

No. 5

---

## Church and Church History in the Confessions

By JAROSLAV PELIKAN

THE current revival of interest in the doctrine of the Church has far-reaching significance for many areas of theological study. Without an adequate appreciation of the nature of the Church much of Christian doctrine cannot attain full articulation. For example, there has always been a close connection between the doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of the means of grace, as Article V of the Augsburg Confession shows. The study of the Old Testament as the record of God's dealings with His people, of the New Testament as the account of God's establishment of His new people, of liturgy as the way the Church worships—these and other fields of theological investigation need to find rooting in the doctrine of the Church and its implications.<sup>1</sup>

In no field is this need more evident, however, than in historical theology, concerned as it is with the Church and its history. As the best study of mankind is man, so the best study of church history is the Church. But from this it follows that some doctrine of the Church, whether explicit or implicit, underlies any presentation or study of church history. If this is so, it would seem that an inadequate or erroneous interpretation of the nature of the Church will also issue in a fallacious method for the study of its history. By a corollary, then, the study of church history must be prefaced by an understanding of the Church as such, just as such study will lead to a deeper understanding of the Church's nature.

As they sought to articulate the doctrine of the Church in antithesis to the various false theories current in the sixteenth century, the Lutheran Confessions presented that doctrine in a form which is of much value to the study of church history. Those

false theories about the Church bore fruit in false theories about its history and about how that history is to be studied. In combating them, therefore, the Confessions also pointed out the weaknesses in the views of history which they produced. Because of the unique contribution which the Confessions make to a study of the doctrine of the Church, and therefore to the study of historical theology, this essay will seek to draw some of the implications of the Lutheran doctrine of the Church for the method and the approach of historical theology.<sup>2</sup>

## I

The principal target of Confessional polemics on the Church was the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Church. According to this doctrine, the Church which Christ established is coterminous with the institution which the Pope heads. All the rights, privileges, and attributes that the New Testament ascribes to the Church are assigned to the papal institution, and properly to it alone; thus this doctrine "transfers to the popes what belongs to the true Church."<sup>3</sup> If anyone wishes to find the Church, he need only look for the presence of the Roman Catholic organization, its bishops and its hierarchy; for our Lord committed to Peter, and through him to his successors, sovereignty over the Church. The Church is, then, essentially a sociological entity, like the family, the State, or any other social grouping in which men band together for certain specific purposes. And to be a member of the Church means to be associated with that sociological entity, regardless of conviction or conversion. Thus for Rome the Church is merely an "external government,"<sup>4</sup> differing from other forms of social organization principally by virtue of its divine validation. Good and evil men belong to it, bound together by their external membership in the ecclesiastical organization even though the objects of their religious loyalty may be as divergent as Christ and Belial.<sup>5</sup>

Against this institutional interpretation of the nature of the Church the Apology of the Augsburg Confession directs very vigorous criticism. If the Church is a sociological entity among sociological entities, what is the qualitative difference between the Church and Israel of old, in which good and evil were held together by their external association with the Israelitic people rather than by a common bond of faith? In Israel there were those whom the

Apology terms "the carnal seed,"<sup>6</sup> carried along by the external promises given the entire nation, but not sharing in the blessings of the everlasting covenant. If the Roman definition of the Church holds, there is no difference between the old and the new Israel on this point. But then the substance is no better than the shadow;<sup>7</sup> and membership in the Church has no greater spiritual significance than did citizenship in Israel. It is a purely sociological function.

Actually this doctrine of the Church had its source in the rationalization of the politico-ecclesiastical situation rather than in a primary theological concern. It was intended to provide divine validation for the organizational maneuverings of the Roman bishop, and the exegetical and doctrinal support for it was supplied after the fact. The theory of papal sovereignty appeared in its most extreme form during the medieval controversies between Church and State. Indeed, one of the most extravagant statements uttered by a Roman Pope, at least before 1859, was the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, a direct result of his controversy with the king of France.<sup>8</sup> It was at times like these that the papacy defined the Church as a "supreme outward monarchy of the whole world, in which the Roman Pontiff necessarily has unquestioned power . . . therefore, the Pope must necessarily be lord of the whole world, of all the kingdoms of the world . . . and must have . . . both swords, temporal and spiritual."<sup>9</sup> Recognizing this desire for organizational prestige and power as the source for Rome's doctrine of the Church, the Smalcald Articles employ deft sarcasm to explain how "the Papacy came to the aid of the poor Church" and accuse the Papacy of having drawn its viewpoints "from the imperial and heathen law."<sup>10</sup>

Because it falsely interprets the Church in terms of its own ecclesiastical institution, Rome inevitably falls into the same fallacy in its interpretation of church history. Compelled to validate its divine right by reference to precedent and example, the Roman system must find support even where there is none. And because it endows a human institution with divine right, it must also endow that institution's history with a divine quality which it does not possess. This need to find historical legitimation for the ecclesiastical institution and its patterns of thought and action causes Rome to attribute to its own history an absolute character which

cannot stand up under the impact of historical criticism. Without such historical legitimation the Roman claim to superiority loses all basis in given fact; hence the desperate insistence upon historical absolutes on the part of Roman Catholic theologians and historians.<sup>11</sup>

In an effort to supply this historical legitimation Roman Catholic historical theology is first of all concerned to demonstrate the historicity of its theory of organizational continuity. The question of the Church's continuing through the ages it answers by pointing to the supposedly unbroken succession which its organization has maintained since Apostolic days, and it proposes to assure the believer that the Church will never perish by reference to the integrity of the Roman institution through the ages.<sup>12</sup> This it does in the face of the fact that often the Church has come to such a state "as if there were no Church, as happened under the papacy,"<sup>13</sup> and in the face of Scriptural warnings "that there will be wicked teachers and wolves."<sup>14</sup> The assurance of the Church continuity cannot come, therefore, from a hypothetical and non-existent organizational succession; for it is a matter of fact "that the holy Church was without the Pope for more than five hundred years, to say the least" — a point to which the "Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" devotes much attention.<sup>15</sup> If the guarantee of the Church's historical continuity is derived from the historical continuity of the papal institution, it cannot withstand the scrutiny of honest historical research.

One feature of this theory which attracted particular attention in the Confessional discussion was the Roman claim that not only the organization as such, but also its rites had been uniformly maintained through the centuries. To the Augustana's thesis that "it is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian Church that everywhere there be observed uniform rites, instituted by men"<sup>16</sup> the Confutation had replied with the insistence that such ceremonial uniformity was indeed necessary for the Church's unity and that it was historically demonstrable.<sup>17</sup> The lengthy and penetrating refutation which the Apology offers to this insistence is based not only upon such Biblical evidence as Col. 2:16 ff.,<sup>18</sup> but also upon irrefutable historical evidence assembled from the fathers and councils of the ancient Church as well as from the churches of

Eastern Christendom,<sup>19</sup> proving "that a lack of uniformity in human observances does not injure the unity of faith."<sup>20</sup>

But the most presumptuous claim to historical absoluteness made by the Roman institution is neither organizational continuity nor ceremonial uniformity, but theological infallibility. Arrogating to themselves all the attributes of the Church, the Popes lay claim to being "pillars of truth."<sup>21</sup> Although the dogma of papal infallibility did not become official until the nineteenth century and had a rather checkered history in the Middle Ages,<sup>22</sup> there was rather wide agreement on the notion that the Roman Church, whether represented by Pope or council or the two in conjunction, was the pillar of truth and that therefore its theological development was a source of religious truth. And though he rarely acted alone in such matters, the Pope did insist that "all rights exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatever he decides and commands with his church is spirit and right, even though it be above and contrary to Scripture or the spoken Word."<sup>23</sup> Viewed in terms of its implications for history, this theory means that what the Popes, councils, and churches have said since the close of the New Testament is not only uniform, but true and binding.

It does not require profound or extensive historical knowledge to demonstrate that this colossal assumption of absoluteness is contrary to the facts of history. For one thing, there is no uniformity in the theological development, for "the writings of the holy Fathers testify that sometimes even they built stubble upon the foundation."<sup>24</sup> After all, the Fathers were men, too.<sup>25</sup> Even if there were a uniformity in the Church's theological tradition, this would not be binding; for "it will not do to frame articles of faith from the works or words of the holy Fathers."<sup>26</sup> And for that matter, the Fathers did not intend their actions and words to become normative in the Church.<sup>27</sup> On both counts, uniformity and authority, the Confessions make use of historical insights to refute Rome's claim of historical absoluteness.

Because of its doctrine of the Church, Roman Catholicism is compelled to interpret church history on the basis of a preconceived system and to explain away the many stubborn and embarrassing facts that cannot be accommodated to that system. Having absolutized its ecclesiastical organization, it must go on to absolutize



that organization's history by ascribing to it an organizational continuity, ceremonial uniformity, and theological infallibility that have no substantiation from historical evidence. The critical attitude of the Confessions toward the idea of an absolute ecclesiastical organization enabled them to be equally critical in dealing with the historical assumptions from that idea and thus to make room for the exercise of objective, critical historical methodology in the study of church history.

## II

But the institutional perversion of the Church and of its history on the part of Roman Catholicism was not the only pivot of the Confessions' concern with the Church and with church history. The Confessional doctrine of the Church, like its doctrine of the Word<sup>28</sup> and of the Lord's Supper,<sup>29</sup> was developed in simultaneous conflict on two fronts. The Confessions rejected with equal vigor the heteronomy of the Roman Catholics, whose institutionalism caused them to ascribe absolute authority to the empirical Church, and the autonomy of the spiritualists, whose Biblicism and individualism caused them to think that each man is his own authority in religious matters.<sup>30</sup>

Only in terms of this ambivalence can the Confessional doctrine of the Church, and therefore its interpretation and use of church history, be adequately understood. Faced by the power of the Roman institution and sensing the loneliness of one whom God had called to a task, Luther had sometimes given voice to what seems to be an individualistic view of the Church.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, when the "enthusiasts" sought to carry out a thorough individualism, he stoutly insisted that no man makes the Church and that membership in the Church is necessary for salvation.<sup>32</sup> The Confessions take account of both these fronts—the Roman Catholic and the radical Protestant—when they articulate the doctrine of the Church in such a way as to avoid the error in both. And as they were compelled to take issue with the Roman Catholic institutionalization of the Church, so they had to defend the reality of the Church, and therefore the value of its history, over against the radical individualism of many Protestants.

Believing that they were carrying out in consistent practice what Luther had asserted in theory,<sup>33</sup> the *Schwaermer* espoused just such a radical individualism. These "fanatics"<sup>34</sup> changed Luther's criti-

cism of the institutional Church into a deprecation and ultimately a rejection of the empirical Church as such. Their deprecation of the empirical Church is particularly evident in their attitude toward the ministry. They held that "the ministry of the Church, the word preached and heard, is not a means whereby God the Holy Ghost teaches men" and that therefore "the minister of the Church who is not on his part truly renewed, righteous, and godly cannot teach other men with profit or administer real, true sacraments."<sup>35</sup> Consistently applied, such a spiritualization of the Church leads to the conclusion that the Church has no concrete reality, but is merely an idea, a "Platonic republic," or, as the German text of the Apology has it, "an imaginary Church, which is nowhere to be found."<sup>36</sup> Only the individual matters, not the Church; for by his decision the individual creates the Church. For this reason the Anabaptists followed through on their individualistic view of faith when they rejected the validity of the Church's Baptism of infants.<sup>37</sup>

In order to defend the reality of the Church against the *Schwaermer* and in order to avoid being classified with them, the authors of the Confessions made their antithesis to this spiritualism very explicit. The two points on which the *Schwaermer* had concentrated in their attack upon the Church, the ministry and Baptism, were also the points of the Confessions' defense. They wanted to defend the ministry "against fanatical men, who dream that the Holy Ghost is not given through the Word"<sup>38</sup> and who therefore despised the ministry and the empirical Church. For this reason the Confessions wanted to retain ordination and were even willing to have it called a sacrament.<sup>39</sup> And in antithesis to the individualism of the Anabaptists, the Confessions stressed the fact that in the Sacraments of the Church, specifically in Baptism, it is not man and his decision, but God and His condescension that has the initiative; for "Baptism is a work, not which we offer to God, but in which God baptizes us, i. e., a minister in the place of God."<sup>40</sup> Underlying the spiritualists' opposition to the empirical Church was their insistence on absolute purity and their refusal to accept anything less than absolute purity in the Church. From its proponents in the ancient Church this viewpoint had derived the name Donatism, but it was by no means restricted to the day of St. Augustine.<sup>41</sup>

In the era of the Reformation, too, some had arisen who maintained "that a congregation in which sinners are still found is no true Christian assembly."<sup>42</sup> Only that is the Church which is absolutely pure, and a group where such absolute purity did not exist they would not call the Church. On the basis of this approach they made of excommunication, that is, of the process of purification, an essential mark of the Church; and "offended by the private vices, whether of priests or of people," they created schisms.<sup>43</sup>

Because Lutheranism, by contrast, wanted to take the empirical Church and its ministrations seriously, it wanted also to take account of the weaknesses which afflicted the Church, and it refused to let those weaknesses frighten it. The Confessions acknowledge that there are those "who hold power *in the Church*, who under the pretext of religion assume to themselves the kingdom of the world . . . who have instituted new services *in the Church*."<sup>44</sup> They realize that wolves and false teachers "become rampant *in the Church*" and that "in the Church itself, infinite is the multitude of the wicked who oppress it."<sup>45</sup> But the Church does not live by its purity; it lives by the forgiveness of sins. And as all life in the forgiveness of sins is the life of one who is at the same time righteous and a sinner, so it is with the Church; "for that is always the kingdom which He quickens by His Spirit, whether it be revealed or covered by the cross . . . and He teaches that the Church has been covered by a multitude of evils, in order that this stumbling block may not offend the pious."<sup>46</sup> Thus also Luther warned his contemporaries: "That is the true Church which prays seriously and in faith: 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.' That is the Church which grows day by day, which day by day puts on the new man and puts off the old man. That is the Church which receives the first fruits of the Spirit: not the tenth part, much less the fullness. We are not yet fully rid of the flesh but are in the process of shedding it and of going forward or growing. Whatever is left of sin, therefore, offends the spiritual Donatists, Manicheans, and Papists; but it does not offend God, for because of faith in Christ He overlooks and forgives it."<sup>47</sup>

An insistence upon absolute purity makes spiritualism contemptuous of the liturgical and theological heritage received from



the ancient, albeit impure, Church of previous centuries. Thus the spiritualists maintained that pure Christians ought not attend services "in those churches in which formerly papal masses have been celebrated and said."<sup>48</sup> In their theology, as in their liturgy, the spiritualists proceeded as though the tradition of past centuries were irrelevant to the theological task and as though they could think theologically without reference to what the Church had thought in the past.<sup>49</sup> The Confessions are anxious to avoid the impression that they share this contempt for tradition. In fact, Article VIII of the Augustana was added for this very reason, to avoid the impression that the Lutherans were Donatist sectarians.<sup>50</sup> Against the charge that they were abolishing the Mass or clerical vestments or other ancient liturgical usages, the Confessions insist that the Lutherans retain all of these; indeed, that they are more faithful in their liturgical observance than are their Roman Catholic opponents.<sup>51</sup>

The spiritualist attitude toward tradition shows the general disregard for the past characteristic of spiritualism. That disregard of the past, in turn, was the product of spiritualism's view of the Church as a Platonic republic; for being a timeless, abstract idea, a Platonic republic has no history.<sup>52</sup> History is of time and space and of the concreteness that is the basic feature of spatio-temporal reality. If the Church is a "civitas Platonica," then its reality cannot be discerned in the ordinary dimensions of space and time. In short, there can be no such thing as church history. The only thing that has a history is empirical Christendom with its errors, impurities, and mistakes, and this empirical Christendom is not the Church.

The history of Christianity since Apostolic days, consequently, emerges as a series of apostasies, in which heresy followed heresy until now, for the first time since the days of the New Testament, a pure Christianity has emerged once more.<sup>53</sup> The principal value of the history of Christianity, then, is a negative one, to show how far from the truth previous generations have strayed. Spiritualism assumes that it can dispense with all that previous generations have thought or done and can read the Scriptures as though no one had ever read them before. These Scriptures it interprets legalistically, even to the point of "imposing upon us the judicial laws of Moses."<sup>54</sup> Between the Scriptures and the present there is very

little that is worth while, for only that is Church which is pure. The history of Christianity is not pure, and therefore the history of Christianity is not the history of the Church.

Carried to its logical conclusion, the spiritualist disregard of tradition and its insistence upon absolute purity ends in a hyper-criticism which supposes that because it can discern the errors of the past, it has been released from the errors of the present. Indeed, since it does not regard the historical Church as Church at all, it deals with this historical and empirical Church as though it were purely a secular thing. There is no need to take the history of the Church seriously, for the Church lives as a Platonic republic, which no one has ever seen or experienced. There is a direct line from this attitude toward the Church and its history to the historical relativism which has been so predominant a feature of many modern church historians.<sup>55</sup> According to this view, all the systems of the history of Christian thought are to be explained in terms of their environment, of the ideological backgrounds of their originators, and of the tradition which they inherited from their past; but none of them can lay claim to the truth, since, in Troeltsch's famous phrase, to be historical is to be relative.<sup>56</sup>

And so Harnack could write the history of dogma as the record of a process which issues in the dissolution of dogma and the re-establishment, after all these centuries, of the "undogmatic Christianity" which was the original message of Jesus.<sup>57</sup> The vast historical learning of Adolf Harnack, who has had few peers, became a tool for his essentially spiritualist contention that the task of the modern Church is to liberate itself from the onus of the past and to demonstrate the untenable character of all that this past has produced. Viewed in this light, the work of the church historian is to debunk the work of his predecessors and to destroy the golden calves of historical tradition. Thus the history of the Church ultimately becomes merely a part of secular history, while the Church as a Platonic republic remains abstracted from the historical process in a realm of superhistorical purity.

### III

From what has been said thus far, the distinctively Lutheran view of the Church and of church history should become clear. For in their articulation of the doctrine of the Church, and hence

in their use of church history, the Lutheran Confessions come to terms with the valid emphases of both Roman Catholic institutionalism and radical Protestant spiritualism, without involving themselves in the errors of either. An oversimplified solution of the dilemma would have been to assert the existence of two Churches—one of them possessing all the attributes which Rome ascribed to the Church, the other characterized by all the qualities which spiritualism assigned to the Church. Such a solution would have meant a position between the two alternatives. But as Gerhard succinctly summarized the Confessional position, "we do not posit two churches."<sup>58</sup> Rather than taking the stand between the two alternatives, the Confessions go beyond them both to the Biblical view of the Church as the "body of Christ,"<sup>59</sup> of which institutionalism and spiritualism, as well as a combination of the two, are misinterpretations.

In relation to Rome therefore the Confessions seek to take the empirical Church seriously. They share the deep concern of Roman Catholicism for the Church as it is, since there is no other. It is this Church which through Baptism and preaching has become "the mother that begets and bears every Christian."<sup>60</sup> It would be crass ingratitude to despise this Church; for, as Professor Nichols has put it: "We recognize the Church as our mother, through whom has come, whether we like it or not, our spiritual life. It is wise to admit the human weaknesses of our parents; it is unwise to suppose that we can dispense with our particular parents now that we have achieved the abstract conception of parenthood."<sup>61</sup> The concluding paragraphs of the Formula of Concord, therefore, enunciate its testimony "in the sight of God and of all Christendom"<sup>62</sup>—no less. But in its profound regard for the empirical Church, Lutheranism rejects the Roman fallacy of equating the Church with any human, historical institution. Indeed, it sees such an equation as an expression of the pride with which churches seek to absolutize themselves and as a mark of Antichrist.<sup>63</sup>

In rejecting Roman Catholic institutionalism, Lutheranism affirms the correctness of a basic spiritualist emphasis, namely, the insistence upon purity. Repeatedly the Apology asserts that the Church is holy<sup>64</sup> and that this holiness cannot be predicated of

any institution, and especially not of the Roman Catholic institution. With spiritualism the Confessions insist that the Church must be holy and that this holiness dare not be taken lightly. But Lutheranism rejects the conclusion which spiritualism draws from this insistence upon holiness: since the empirical Church is not holy, since indeed no one has ever experienced a pure and holy Church, the Church must be an abstract, a Platonic republic. Rather, Lutheranism emphasizes at the same time the holiness and the reality of the Church, and it sees in this paradox merely another example of the "already — not yet" that marks the entire Christian life.<sup>65</sup>

The interpretation of church history flowing from this we have sought to summarize thus: "According to Lutheran theology, it would seem that history is the conditioned bearer of the activity of God. This applies alike to the Church and to the Church's witness. For this reason, Lutheranism is not fearful of historical criticism, for it does not pin its faith on the infallibility of the historical Church. But when such criticism discovers that the historical Church is indeed historical and that it has not managed to escape the corruption that affects all things historical, Lutheran theology does not discard its regard for the historical Church. . . . It devotes itself to the study of Patristic theology, not with authoritarian reverence, nor yet with supercilious contempt, but with a deep regard and a healthy suspicion."<sup>66</sup>

Lutheranism should, therefore, strive to agree "with the holy Fathers . . . and with the holy Church of Christ"<sup>67</sup> and to take the past seriously; but in the process it should not become idolatrous or obscurantist, even and especially about its own past. It should, rather, remain critical, even of ancient and venerable tradition, as was Luther in his examination of the ancient councils.<sup>68</sup> But in its criticism it ought not become relativistic or iconoclastic, for despite all its failings this is still the history of the Church. It would require another essay to demonstrate this attitude of critical regard in the historical work of Chemnitz, Seckendorf, the authors of the *Magdeburg Centuries*, and other Lutheran church historians.<sup>69</sup> But this critical regard is surely the only approach which is permissible in the light of all that the Lutheran Confessions have to say about the nature of the Church and of its history.

St. Louis, Mo.

## NOTES

1. Cf. the comments of K. L. Schmidt *s. v.* ἐκκλησία in Gerhard Kittel (ed.), *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, III, p. 525, on the inseparable conjunction of the Messiah and the people of God. On Art. V of the Augustana see the essay of F. E. Mayer, "De Ministerio Ecclesiastico, Augustana V," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXI (1950), pp. 881—895. A handy summary of the revival of interest in the Church among Continental theologians is the little volume by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *The Kingship of Christ* (New York, 1948), esp. pp. 89—116.
2. For some stimulating suggestions on this theme cf. Walther Koehler, *Historie und Metahistorie in der Kirchengeschichte*, Heft 28 of "Philosophie und Geschichte" (Tuebingen, 1930); James Hastings Nichols, "History in the Theological Curriculum," *Journal of Religion*, XXVI (1946), pp. 183—189; Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History* (New York, 1949), esp. the closing chapters, pp. 196—243; Wilhelm Pauck, "The Dynamics of Protestantism," *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston, 1950), pp. 147 to 156.
3. Apology, Art. VII, par. 27, *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis, 1921), p. 235.
4. The phrase occurs several times in the Apology, Art. VII: "politia externa certarum gentium," par. 10, *Triglotta*, p. 228; "externa politia bonorum et malorum," par. 13, *Triglotta*, p. 230. Caspar Cruciger makes use of the same phrase in his criticism of the Roman view, *In epistolam ad Timotheum priorem commentarius* (Strassburg, 1540), p. 114.
5. Apology, Art. VII, par. 16—19, *Triglotta*, pp. 231—233, on the wicked in the Church. See Luther's strong answer to this theory: "Von dem Papsttum zu Rom wider den hochberuehmten Romanisten zu Leipzig" (1520), *Werke* (Weimar Ed., henceforth abbreviated as *W. A.*), VI, 301.
6. Apology, Art. VII, par. 14, *Triglotta*, p. 231. Precisely this was Luther's argumentation already in the "Dictata super Psalterium" (1513—1516), *W. A.* III, 632; cf. also *ibid.*, IV, 24, on the same issue.
7. Apology, Art. VII, par. 15, *Triglotta*, p. 231.
8. On this entire development cf. Albert Hyma's concise chapter on "Church and State in the Middle Ages" in his *Christianity and Politics* (Philadelphia, 1938), pp. 11—59, with helpful bibliography; and the more recent work of Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, tr. by R. F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940), esp. pp. 38—60, on "The Medieval Conception of the Hierarchy."
9. Apology, Art. VII, par. 23, *Triglotta*, p. 235. On the development of the "two swords" theory, see Ph. Kates, *The Two Swords. A Study of the Union of Church and State* (Washington, 1928).
10. Smalcald Articles, Part III, Art. III, par. 24, *Triglotta*, p. 485; Part II, Art. IV, par. 14, *Triglotta*, p. 475.
11. Thus Leo XIII insisted that the Catholic historian "must never lose sight of the fact that history contains a collection of dogmatic facts which impose themselves upon our faith and which nobody is permitted to call in doubt," quoted by J. H. Nichols, *op. cit.*, p. 184.
12. In opposition to this Luther set his view of the "successio fidelium"; see the summary comments of Karl Holl, "Die Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I, *Luther* (7th ed.; Tuebingen, 1948), pp. 298—299.
13. Apology, Art. VII, par. 9, *Triglotta*, p. 229 (German text); cf. also Apology, Art. XXIV, par. 97, *Triglotta*, pp. 417—419 (German text).



14. Apology, Art. VII, par. 22, *Triglotta*, p. 235.
15. Smalcald Articles, Part II, Art. IV, par. 4, *Triglotta*, p. 473; "Tractatus," par. 12—21, *Triglotta*, pp. 507—509.
16. Augsburg Confession, Art. VII, par. 3, *Triglotta*, p. 47.
17. "Confutatio pontificia" in M. Reu, *The Augsburg Confession* (Chicago, 1930), II, pp. 353—354.
18. Apology, Art. VII, par. 35, *Triglotta*, p. 239.
19. Apology, Art. XXIV, par. 6, *Triglotta*, p. 385.
20. Apology, Art. VII, par. 45, *Triglotta*, p. 243; also Apology, Art. XV, par. 49—52, *Triglotta*, p. 329.
21. Apology, Art. VII, par. 27, *Triglotta*, p. 235; see also par. 20, *Triglotta*, p. 233, for the Apology's interpretation of "pillars of truth" in 1 Tim. 3:15.
22. See the interesting compilation of data on the patristic and medieval development in W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility* (Milwaukee, 1910), pp. 9—65.
23. Smalcald Articles, Part III, Art. VIII, par. 4, *Triglotta*, p. 495; also "An den christlichen Adel" (1520), *W. A.* VI, 459.
24. Apology, Art. VII, par. 21, *Triglotta*, p. 233; on the lack of uniformity among the fathers in the matter of terminology, cf. Apology, Art. XIII, par. 2, *Triglotta*, p. 309.
25. "Thus the fathers were men, too, who often made concessions to the customs and opinions of their times": Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, ed. by E. Preuss (Leipzig, 1915), p. 624.
26. Smalcald Articles, Part II, Art. II, par. 15, *Triglotta*, p. 467.
27. Apology, Art. XV, par. 13, *Triglotta*, p. 319.
28. Without an understanding of this, Luther's view of the Word becomes autonomy (everyone believes what he pleases because of the "right of private interpretation") or heteronomy (the Bible is a code of law, whose authority is legalistic in nature and derivation). That neither of these was his view in the controversy with the *Schwaermer* and in the controversy with Rome is the central thesis of R. H. Gruetzmacher, *Wort und Geist. Eine historische und dogmatische Untersuchung zum Gnadenmittel des Wortes* (Leipzig, 1902).
29. From the voluminous literature I cite the penetrating essay of Erich Seeberg, "Der Gegensatz zwischen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld und Luther" in Wilhelm Koepp (ed.), *Reinhold Seeberg — Festschrift, I, Zur Theorie des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 43—80, pointing out the importance of seeing Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in terms of the several fronts on which he was fighting.
30. The authoritative presentation of Luther's relation to the spiritualists is still that of Karl Holl, "Luther und die Schwaermer," *op. cit.*, pp. 420—467.
31. Professor Pauck's chapter on "Luther's Faith" and on "Luther's Conception of the Church," *op. cit.*, pp. 15—54, highlight this ambivalence in Luther's view of his own task and his view of the total Church; see the passages quoted by Pauck, *ibid.*, pp. 297—298, note 33.
32. "Without the Church, no one can come to Christ the Lord," Large Catechism, Part II, par. 45, *Triglotta*, p. 689; "outside the Church, where there is no Gospel, there is no forgiveness," *ibid.*, par. 56, *Triglotta*, p. 693. Cf. also Apology, Art. IX, par. 52, *Triglotta*, p. 245: "the promise of salvation . . . does not, however, pertain to those who are outside God's Church."

33. Holl, "Luther und die Schwaermer," p. 423, n. 1.
34. Apology, Art. XIII, par. 13, *Triglotta*, p. 311.
35. Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, Art. XII, par. 30, 35, *Triglotta*, p. 1101.
36. Apology, Art. VII, par. 20, *Triglotta*, p. 233. It is typical of Lutheran presentations of this matter that Cruciger (see note 4 above) immediately follows his rejection of the "external government" theory with the warning, *op. cit.*, p. 115: "We do not speak of the Church as a Platonic republic, which exists nowhere." This was the Roman Catholic charge; for Rome, like the *Schwaermer*, did not see the Lutheran view as a *tertium quid*; cf. Luther's reply to this charge, *W. A.*, VII, 683.
37. Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, "The Relation of Faith and Knowledge in the Lutheran Confessions," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXI (1950), pp. 327—328.
38. Apology, Art. XIII, par. 13, *Triglotta*, p. 311.
39. On ordination, Apology, Art. XIV, par. 24, *Triglotta*, p. 315; on ordination as Sacrament, Apology, Art. XIII, par. 11, *Triglotta*, p. 311, and R. H. Gruetzmacher, "Beitraege zur Geschichte der Ordination in der evangelischen Kirche," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XXIII (1912), pp. 363—379.
40. Apology, Art. XXIV, par. 18, *Triglotta*, p. 389.
41. Augustana, Art. VIII, par. 3, *Triglotta*, p. 47; Apology, Art. VII, par. 29, *Triglotta*, p. 237.
42. Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, Art. XII, par. 14, *Triglotta*, p. 1099.
43. Apology, Art. VII, par. 49, *Triglotta*, p. 245; on excommunication cf. Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, Art. XII, par. 34, *Triglotta*, p. 1101.
44. Apology, Art. XXIV, par. 41, *Triglotta*, p. 399; italics my own.
45. Apology, Art. VII, par. 22, *Triglotta*, p. 235, and par. 9, *Triglotta*, p. 229; italics my own.
46. Apology, Art. VII, par. 18—19, *Triglotta*, p. 233. On "simul iustus et peccator" cf. my brief comments, "The Doctrine of Man in the Lutheran Confessions," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, II, (1950), pp. 42—44; on the Kingdom as hidden by the Cross, cf. Tileman Hesshusius, *Examen theologicum* (2d ed.; Frankfurt, 1578), p. 230.
47. "Enarratio Psalmi XC," *W. A.*, XL-3, 506. Actually Luther had come to this insight much earlier; thus he says already in the "Dictata" of 1513 to 1516 that "this is spoken of the Church Militant; all who are in this are standing and growing, not sitting and possessing, as do the blessed in glory," *W. A.*, IV, 400.
48. Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, Art. XII, par. 15, *Triglotta*, p. 1099.
49. The contrast between Luther and spiritualism on this point is well brought out by Karl Eicke, *Schwenckfeld, Luther und der Gedanke einer apostolischen Reformation* (Berlin, 1911).
50. See the explanation given by the Apology, Art. VII, par. 3, *Triglotta*, p. 227.
51. Apology, Art. XV, par. 38—44, pp. 325—327; *ibid.*, par. 51—52, *Triglotta*, p. 329; also Art. XXIV, par. 1—3, *Triglotta*, pp. 383—385; Art. VII, par. 33, *Triglotta*, p. 239.
52. Cf. Oscar Cullman, *Christ and Time*, tr. by Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia, 1950), p. 52 and *passim*.
53. "Just as it is possible to travel in strange lands and observe only that the natives are so ignorant that they cannot speak English, so one may retrace history, even the religious history of his own community, with patronizing

- provinciality," Nichols, *op. cit.*, p. 186. Cf. also the somewhat surprising comments of Karl Barth, "Ueber die Aufgabe einer Geschichte der neueren Theologie," *Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zurich, 1947), pp. 1—15.
54. Apology, Art. XVI, par. 55, *Triglotta*, p. 331.
  55. On this relativism and its philosophical derivation, cf. R. H. Gruetzmacher, "Die skeptische Stellung zur Geschichte in der systematischen Theologie der Gegenwart," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XXIII (1912), pp. 675—689.
  56. Otto Hintze, "Troeltsch und die Probleme des Historismus," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXV (1926—1927), pp. 188—239, is all the more illuminating because it is not written from the specific viewpoint of church history.
  57. Cf. the brief but unusually scintillating discussion of Werner Elert, *Die Kirche und Ihre Dogmengeschichte* (Munich, 1950), pp. 3—8, on the connection between Harnack and Biblicism.
  58. Johann Gerhard, "Disputatio de Ecclesia," *Disputationes theologicae* (Jena, 1655), p. 1533, where he continues: "we believe and confess one Church, and assert that this is treated in Scripture in a double way (bifariam)."
  59. Apology, Art. VII, par. 5, *Triglotta*, p. 227; par. 29, *Triglotta*, p. 237.
  60. Large Catechism, Part II, Art. III, par. 42, *Triglotta*, p. 689. For an interpretation of this passage, cf. Gustav Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, tr. by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 347—350; on the concept of the Church as mother, see the dissertation of Joseph C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (Washington, 1943), particularly the illuminating discussion of Cyprian, pp. 81—106.
  61. *Op. cit.*, p. 185. Another statement from the same paragraph: "It is well to confess that Christianity has been in a sense an earthly failure, provided we can also discern how from the resources of her memory have come again and again the pricks of self-condemnation and abasement, provided we observe how uniquely she has confessed the holiness and mercy of God amid her own corruptions."
  62. Formula of Concord, Solida Declaratio, Art. XII, par. 40, *Triglotta*, p. 1103.
  63. Apology, Art. VII, par. 24, *Triglotta*, p. 235 (German text); and Art. XV, par. 19—21, *Triglotta*, pp. 319—321.
  64. Most expressly in Apology, Art. VII, par. 7—8, *Triglotta*, p. 229; also par. 16, *Triglotta*, p. 231, and *passim*.
  65. On this paradox and its application to various areas see the "Foreword" of F. E. Mayer, *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXI (1950), pp. 1—7.
  66. Jaroslav Pelikan, "Form and Tradition in Worship. A Theological Interpretation," *Essays Presented at the First Liturgical Institute* (Valparaiso, 1950), pp. 22—23.
  67. Apology, Art. III (actually part of Art. IV), par. 268, *Triglotta*, p. 225; see also the following paragraphs on the Roman Church.
  68. "Von den Conciliis und Kirchen" (1539), *W. A.*, L, 509—653; Walther Koehler, *Luther und die Kirchengeschichte*, I (Erlangen, 1900); and Otto Ritschl's chapter on "Luther und die dogmatische Tradition der alten Kirche," *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, I (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 268 to 275.
  69. For an evaluation of Seckendorf's objectivity, see Lewis W. Spitz, "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf and the *Historia Lutheranismi*," *Journal of Religion*, XXV (1945), pp. 33—44.



# The Principium Cognoscendi of Roman Catholic Theology

By F. E. MAYER

FOR a time it seemed that Rome made honest attempts to bring about a *rapprochement* to Protestantism and to remove as far as possible all obstacles in the way of a reunion of all Christian denominations. In the encyclical *Provida Matris* of May, 1895, the Pope suggested prayers for the reconciliation with the separated *brethren* (italics our own). In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* of 1943 and again in the Christmas message of 1949 the Roman pontiff seemingly welcomed discussions between Catholic and Protestant theologians. In the Christmas message the Pope did not seem to be averse in principle to a "brotherly" theological examination of that which separates Christian confessions. As a result, many Protestant theologians hoped that the papal Church would participate in the ecumenical movement, more specifically, send official representatives to the first meeting of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam.<sup>1</sup> The *Una Sancta* movement, in which Protestant and Catholic theologians of Europe joined in Biblical, dogmatical, and historical studies, seemed to be a good omen and to indicate that Rome no longer held to its former position that it alone is the saving Church and that no Protestant denomination has any right of existence. Unfortunately, some Protestants actually believe that Rome is "merely a dissident sister church." This trend prompted Cardinal Spellman to say that the Catholic Church should not hurry to deal with the Protestants on the entire question of reunion, for within the next sixty years the "separated brethren" will return to Rome of their own accord.

Rome has not only not receded from its position that it cannot grant equal rights to Protestant denominations, but has reiterated its position that the Catholic Church is the only divinely recognized denomination and that reunion of Christendom can be brought about solely and alone through a return of Protestants

to the Catholic Church. Father Boyer says: "The Catholic Church is disposed to permit Protestant denominations to retain certain non-essential characteristics if they are willing to recognize certain dogmas which the Vatican holds as essential; for one, *obedience to the Pope* [italics our own]. In this regard Protestants generally do not understand how liberal the Catholic attitude is."<sup>2</sup>

All discussions with Rome which dodge the Roman Catholic *principium cognoscendi* are vain and futile. It is therefore highly significant that one understands clearly Rome's complete departure from historic Protestantism and from Lutheranism in particular. The issue really is *sola Scriptura* versus *solus papa*.

In the Fourth Session (April 8, 1546) the Council of Trent declared that the Gospel is

the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline, [and that] this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand . . . and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.<sup>3</sup>

The Church, bound by this decree, teaches the dictation theory of inspiration and accepts the canonical writings as divinely inspired and therefore as God's message to man. In his Encyclical *Spiritus Paracletus* of 1920, Benedict XV not only encouraged the reading of the Bible by granting an indulgence of 300 days to the faithful who shall read the books of the Scripture for at least a quarter of an hour, but also stated that Scripture has "been bestowed upon the human race for their instruction in Divine things."<sup>4</sup> This seems to be a radical departure from Rome's position prior to Trent. The fact is that Luther had so successfully defended the *Sola Scriptura* principle that the Council of Trent was compelled to modify its traditional position and to couch its formal principle in terminology which made Rome appear to champion the *Sola Scriptura* principle. But the formal principle of Rome has undergone no change and must still be summarized in the words of the Smalcald Articles:

The Papacy is nothing but sheer enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart, and what-

ever he decides and commands within his Church is spirit and right, even though it is above, and contrary to, Scripture and the spoken Word.<sup>5</sup>

Appealing to 1 Tim. 3:15, Rome claims that the *ecclesia docens*, i.e., the hierarchy, more specifically the Pope, is the infallible teacher in determining both the scope of the subject matter to be accepted and the sense in which this is to be believed. The Council of Trent states that the "Gospel" is contained in the written books (the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments) as well as in the unwritten traditions (the extra-Scriptural statements on faith and morals contained in the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of the Councils, and the official pronouncements of the papal See). It must be kept in mind, however, that both groups of writings come under the general heading of "tradition." Since the days of Bellarmine, Rome distinguished between "objective" or "material," and "formal" tradition. The former term denotes the subject matter transmitted, the latter the act of transmission. The Church "hands down" (Latin: *tradit*) the "Gospel" as it is allegedly contained either in the Scriptures or in the traditions. Neither the Scriptures nor the tradition, nor both, but the teaching office is the final source and norm of faith and discipline. As judge and interpreter of both, it is bound neither by traditions nor by Scripture. Anthony C. Cotter states that the ultimate explanation of the obscurity of the Bible is God Himself, whereby God purposed to make the *magisterium* the primary recipient of all revelation, the Bible included, so that the *magisterium* may properly be called the primary and even the only source of revelation.<sup>6</sup> This is, as Luther called it, "sheer enthusiasm," fanaticism, *Schwaermerei*. And in the final analysis enthusiasm and rationalism always go hand in hand. Rome's formal principle therefore determines the place and significance which it ascribes (1) to Scripture, (2) to the traditions, and (3) to reason.

# 1

Rome claims that its high regard for the Bible is evidenced in the fact that most of the New Testament authors were members of the Catholic Church, that this Church has given the Bible to Christendom, and that it considers the Bible a precious storehouse of dogmatic and moral instruction. Rome nevertheless insists that

*the Church has authority over the Scripture, and not the Bible over the Church.*

a. Rome teaches that the Bible is inadequate and insufficient and needs the supplementation which the Church alone can provide. Bellarmine stated that the New Testament Epistles were written only to meet certain local conditions, and Andrada, the official interpreter of Trent, declared that the New Testament books served only as "notes" to aid the Apostles' memory. On the basis of Jer. 31:33 he argues that the chief difference between the two Testaments is that the Old was written on tablets of stone and paper, whereas the New was written almost entirely into the heart of the Church. The Roman apologists usually argue as follows:

Christ did not say, Sit down and write Bibles and let everyone judge for himself. That injunction was left for the 16th century, and we have seen the result of it in the founding of 500 religions all quarreling with one another about the interpretation of the Bible.<sup>7</sup>

Thomas F. Coakley writes:

The Catholic Church existed before the Bible; it is possible for the Catholic Church to exist without the Bible, for the Catholic Church is altogether independent of the Bible. The Bible does not give any systematic, complete, and exhaustive treatment of the doctrines of Christ. In many respects it is, like a stenographer's note book, partial and fragmentary, to be supplemented later on in more elaborate detail by other agencies. Christ never wrote a word of the Bible. One might naturally expect Him to have set the example by writing at least some portions of the Bible if He intended His followers to take their entire religion from it. Christ never ordered His apostles to write any part of the Bible. We might well expect such a command from Him if He desired the members of His Church to have recourse to the Bible for their religion. Christ could not have intended that the world should take its religion from the Bible, since so many millions of the human race today, to say nothing of the past, cannot read or write.<sup>8</sup>

b. The Roman Catholic Church claims the authority to determine the Scriptural canon and has decreed that the Vulgate is to "be held as authentic and that no one is to dare, or presume, to reject it under any pretext whatever."<sup>9</sup> A number of significant Roman doctrines depend for proof on faulty Vulgate translations,

e. g., Gen. 3:17 (*ipsa tibi conteret caput*); Eph. 5:32 (the Greek word *mysterion* is rendered *sacramentum*); 1 Cor. 4:1 (*dispensatores sumus* has been used as an argument to prove that the hierarchy may dispense the laity from the cup).<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Trent decreed that the Apocrypha belong to the canon and must be accepted as inspired and dictated by the Holy Ghost. Some of the apocryphal writings are extremely valuable to Rome, inasmuch as they may be used to support such doctrines as the expiatory power of good works (Tob. 4:11 f.), the intercession of angels and saints (Tob. 12:12), intercessory prayers for the dead (2 Macc. 12:44 ff.).

c. Rome views the Bible and the traditions as the "law or constitution of the church" and therefore argues that as the Supreme Court must interpret the Federal Constitution, so there must be a living authority which determines the meaning of the Church's constitution. Appealing to 2 Pet. 1:20—but completely ignoring the context—Rome states that as little as any citizen may put his own construction on the law of the land, so little is a member of the Church permitted to exercise the right of "private interpretation." This is maintained in spite of the definite injunction (Acts 17:11) that Christians should on the basis of Scripture examine the doctrines presented to them. Rome's claim to be the official "supreme court" is a clear case of such "private interpretation" as is forbidden in 2 Pet. 1:20. Rome claims, furthermore, that the Bible is a dark book, hard to understand, and in need of official interpretation. Even if it is granted that the sections in Paul's Letters which St. Peter (2 Pet. 3:16) declared to be hard to understand contain doctrines which are essential to salvation, the Romanists overlook the fact that while Holy Writ contains passages difficult to understand, the saving truth is clearly set forth. According to the Tridentine profession, the right to judge the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures belongs alone to the Church, and no layman nor theologian dare interpret them otherwise than in the sense which Mother Church has held and does hold.<sup>11</sup> "Mother Church," however, defies all hermeneutical principles. The Council of Trent proves the institution of the sacrament of penance with Luke 13:5; Acts 2:38; the cup under one kind is justified on the basis of 1 Cor. 4:1; 11:34; the daily Mass

as an unbloody sacrifice is supported with Mal. 1:11. The explanatory notes in the Douay Version show the arbitrary manner in which Rome employs Scriptures.<sup>12</sup>

d. Rome's attitude toward the Scripture can probably be gauged best by its regulations concerning the reading of the Bible by the laity. Rome denies the charges frequently made that it proscribes Bible reading by the laity, claiming, on the one hand, that the Church has never issued an absolute and categorical interdiction of Bible reading, and pointing, on the other hand, to the encyclicals of Leo XIII (*Spiritus Paracletus*) and of Pius XII (*Divino Afflante Spiritu*) which encourage Bible reading. Both claims must be carefully evaluated. In 1199, Innocent III declared that the desire to read the Bible is to be commended, but that the reading in "conventicles" (without the supervision of the duly appointed priest) is not to be tolerated, because the profundity of Scriptures is such that not only the unlearned, but also the *docti et prudentes* cannot grasp its meaning. By an allegorical interpretation of Ex. 19:13 (the animal which touched the Holy Mountain Sinai was to be stoned) they seek to prove that no unlearned person (*aliquis et indoctus*) dare presume to delve into the sublimity of the Scriptures and preach it to others.<sup>13</sup> In 1229 the Synod of Toulouse decreed that the laity should not be permitted to have the books of the Old and New Testaments, with the exception of the Psalter, the breviary for the holy office, and *horas beatae Mariae*, for devotional purposes. In accord with the resolution of Trent that a commission be established to prepare an index of prohibited books, Pius IV in 1564 issued the bull *Dominici gregis custodiae*, in which he laid down ten rules to guide the *congregatio indicis* (now the Congregation of the Holy Office) in establishing the *index librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum*. The fourth rule reads:

Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, because of men's rashness (*temeritas*) more evil than good arises, let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor stand in this respect, so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures, made by Catholic writers, to those whom they understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and



piety from such reading; which permit (*facultas*) let them have in writing. But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles or have them in possession without such faculty shall not be capable of receiving absolution for their sins, unless they have first given up their Bibles to the ordinary (the bishop).<sup>14</sup>

Significant are the statements of the Constitution *Unigenitus*, in which Clement XI (1713) condemned the propositions of Quesnel that the Bible should be read by all and that the obscurity of the Bible does not exempt the laity from reading the Word of God. When the newly organized Bible Societies developed great activity at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Popes in unmistakable language condemned them. Pius VII not only condemned the Protestant Bible Societies as a pestilence, a snare prepared for men's eternal ruin, tares sown by the adversaries, but also dissolved the Catholic Bible Societies. Leo XII spoke of the Bibles published by the Protestant Bible Societies as poisonous pastures. Pius IX in the Syllabus of 1864 condemned them as being on the same level with Communism, Socialism, secret societies; and Leo XIII in the index of 1897 proscribed all except officially approved and annotated versions. Thus, although Rome has never issued an absolute prohibition of Bible reading by the laity, it is equally true that the recent encouragements to read the Bible are restricted and qualified. The regulations of Pius IV in Rule Four still stand. Rome still claims that the reading of approved Bibles is not only unnecessary, but is in many instances pernicious. For, though the Bible is a precious treasure, it may be misused.<sup>15</sup> Therefore the reading of the Bible is permitted only to such as have obtained a special "faculty" from the ordinary. Inasmuch as indulgences can be gained by the mere reading of the Bible, one is prompted to ask whether such reading is considered a work of supererogation. And one wonders why Rome should encourage the reading of the Bible, since the Church does not consider the Bible the source and norm of doctrine nor the power of God unto salvation.

2

Rome teaches that the "Gospel" is contained also in the "un-written traditions," the writings of the Fathers, and the pronouncements of the Church through the centuries. The last verse of

John's Gospel teaches that not everything is set down in the Scriptures. Rome interprets this to mean that part of Christian doctrine must be sought elsewhere, namely, in the "traditions" (2 Thess. 2:14; Acts 2:42). These traditions (*traditio materialis*) were given to the Apostles and their rightful successors, deposited in the shrine of the Church, and are to be proclaimed by the infallible Church (*traditio formalis*) as the occasion demands. This explains the long list of new doctrines published throughout the centuries. Rome's doctrinal system is not yet complete, for there are such important doctrines as that of original sin on which there is no full agreement. Even its ecclesiology is, as Dominus Coster said in 1941, still in the "pre-theological state."<sup>16</sup>

To the Protestant this appears to be a clear case of development of doctrine. But Rome answers that it is impossible for her to proclaim new doctrines. "It can, however, develop more and more the truth entrusted to it, can define it more exactly, and can develop the entire wealth of revelation with increasing clarity. By this process not one of the dogmas previously held is rejected nor are any added which have not been previously taught implicitly."<sup>17</sup> Francis J. Conell states: "Nothing can be added to the deposit of divine revelation since the death of the last apostle, because the truths proclaimed by Christ and the apostles were intended as the completion of the message of God to the human race." He continues to set forth that the Pope's infallibility does not imply the pronouncement of new doctrines. It extends to the explanation of the revealed truth and to those doctrines which are intimately connected with, though not actually contained in, "the deposit of truth."<sup>18</sup> Rome says there can be no development of doctrine, for, according to John 16:12, all doctrines have always been believed implicitly, even though not taught explicitly. A view, held by only some in the Church, as a *pia sententia*, will not be elevated to an official doctrine until sufficient tradition has been found to support it. "The policy of the Church is to be cautious and slow in taking novel views, such as tend to shock and alarm the simple-minded, until such views have been firmly established by evidence." In defense of the new doctrine of papal infallibility Cardinal Gibbons stated:

The Council did not create a new creed, but rather confirmed



the old one. It formulated into an article of faith a truth which in every age had been accepted by the Catholic world because it had been *implicitly* [italics ours] contained in the deposit of revelation.<sup>19</sup>

Cardinal Newman in his essay on *The Development of Christian Doctrine* and Johann Moehler in his *Einheit in der Kirche* present virtually the same views in answering the charge of development. Moehler says:

The Divine Spirit, to whom is entrusted the guidance and vivification of the Church, becomes by His union with the human spirit in the Church a peculiarly Christian intuition, a deep sure guiding feeling, which, as it abides in truth, leads also into all truth . . . is not purely an internal act, but is always based on external testimony and outward authority, preceded by an outward certainty. . . . The Church, therefore, as representing Christ, is the living exposition of the divine revelation and thus invested with Christ's own authority and infallibility. . . . If the Church is not the authority representing Christ, then everything relapses into darkness, uncertainty, doubt, distraction, unbelief, and superstition. Revelation becomes null and void, fails in its real purpose and must henceforth be even called in question and finally denied. . . . All developments in dogma as well as in morality can be considered as resulting from formal acts of the whole community.<sup>20</sup>

Thus Rome teaches that no new doctrine can be taught, while it is an historical fact that Rome has promulgated many new doctrines. This constitutes no contradiction for Roman theologians, who claim that the *ecclesia docens* is infallible and that all doctrines were deposited in the shrine of the Church and were implicitly held since the death of the last Apostle. The Vatican Council in the dogmatic decree on faith declares:

All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down (*in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito*), and which the Church either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.<sup>21</sup>

This is "sheer enthusiasm" and grants the Church unlimited reign in promulgating "new doctrines." And that is the real meaning of *traditio*.

## 3

Finally, *reason* is considered a reliable source of religious knowledge. Following the example of the early Apologists (especially Justin Martyr and his *logos spermatikos* theory), the Scholastics maintained that both reason and revelation are divine gifts and can therefore never be at variance with each other.<sup>22</sup> The earlier Scholastics leaned heavily on Plato with his emphasis on intuitive knowledge. Anselm's famous ontological argument for the existence of God is based on Platonic idealism (*universalia ante rem*). It runs something like this: We have the *idea* of an absolutely Perfect Being. To be perfect a being must have existence. Therefore an absolutely perfect being must exist.<sup>23</sup> The later Scholastics, especially Thomas Aquinas, introduced the empirical method and the inductive logic of Aristotle into the realm of theology (*universalia in re*). Thomas therefore alters Anselm's process completely and on the basis of Aristotelean dialectics employs the following four steps to prove the existence of God: (1) Demonstration by natural reason of the existence of God; (2) establishment by reason of the existence of freedom and immortality of the soul; (3) transition from reason to faith in revelation; and (4) recognition of the Church as the authoritative interpreter of the true revelation.<sup>24</sup> Catholic theologians maintain that human reason is competent up to a certain point and that it is also competent to determine where its competence ends. Otherwise it could not be competent anywhere. Thomas gave a high rank to reason and the intellect, and he is today the recognized teacher of Catholic theology.<sup>25</sup> It is therefore not surprising that the entire theology of Rome is supported by rationalistic arguments.

While Rome frequently claims that she employs logic primarily for apologetic reasons, a study of standard dogmatic works of Rome shows conclusively that throughout her theological system reason is considered a legitimate source of divine truths. This rationalistic principle becomes evident, not only in such points of doctrine as are accepted by all Christians, but especially in those Roman teachings which have been elevated from pious opinions to dogmas of the Church. A good case in point are the rational arguments for the dogma of the assumption of Mary, for which there are admittedly no historic evidences.<sup>26</sup> Another case in point is Rome's

approach to the doctrine of the Trinity. While the Bible-centered theologian believes the doctrine of the Trinity, though it is contrary to natural reason and above the enlightened reason, the Roman theologian argues as follows: It must be granted that this doctrine is not contrary to *divine* reason, and therefore cannot conflict with human reason. Since the doctrine is not contrary to divine reason, it cannot contain any contradiction; and since it actually does not contain any contradiction, human reason cannot find any contradiction where there is none.<sup>27</sup>

Rome will probably never repeat the Galileo incident, since its rationalistic principle enables the Church today to adjust itself to current scientific claims and theories — but only in so far as there is no conflict with fixed dogmas of the Church. The Church will accept the findings of modern psychology so long as they are not contrary to its views concerning the freedom and immortality of the soul.<sup>28</sup> But while Rome insists on maintaining the supernatural origin of each soul (creationism), it holds that

the general theory of evolution is not only unobjectionable, it becomes a necessary conclusion from sound Catholic principles. Christian philosophy does not admit supernatural interference where the natural order suffices. . . . Man's *body* is the result of natural forces put into the world by God.<sup>29</sup>

The various encyclicals on social and moral problems, on the relation of Church and State, on capitalism and labor, reflect throughout the rationalistic principle. If one grants the major premises, then one is compelled by cold logic to accept the inevitable conclusions.

A theology based on reason appeals to man, since it is on man's level. It is, as Ph. Melancthon points out, a theology of the law, a theology of the natural man.<sup>30</sup> At first glance a theology of reason should lead to certainty; in reality it is a theology of doubt. There are violent differences among leading theologians on important points of doctrine; there are even different schools of thought; and finally, Romanists expressly deny that a Christian can attain to absolute assurance in matters of faith. Roman dogmaticians usually speak of three types of assurance, metaphysical, theological, and absolute.<sup>31</sup> Since no man can be certain that his reason and intellect have correctly interpreted the empirical the-

ological data, he is compelled to transfer to the Church the responsibility of rightly interpreting all religious facts.<sup>32</sup>

Whether Rome appeals to the Scriptures, or to the traditions, or to reason as the source of doctrine, in the final analysis its formal principle is *sola ecclesia, solus papa*.

St. Louis, Mo.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Rene Pache, "Rome and the Ecumenical Movement," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 108, January issue, 1951. See also *Ecumenical Review*, Vol. I, 2, p. 200.
2. Pache, *loc. cit.*, p. 60.
3. Council of Trent, Sess. IV, Waterworth ed., 18; J. Neuner, S. J., and H. Roos, S. J., *Der Glaube der Kirche*, Regensburg, 1938, p. 64 f.
4. See Preface to New Testament, Paterson, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941.
5. The Smalcald Articles, Part III, Art. VIII, 4.
6. "The Obscurity of the Bible," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. IX (1947), 453—464. For a detailed presentation of the formal principle of Rome see W. Wilmers, *Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion*. Ein Handbuch zu De Harbes katholischem Katechismus. 4 vols., Muenster. The seventh edition was prepared by Jos. Hontheim, 1907, I, 171 ff. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
7. Tract, *Truth About Catholics*, Los Angeles, Cath. Lit. Board, 1936, p. 2. See also James Cardinal Gibbons, *Faith of Our Fathers*, Baltimore, John Murphy Co., 1917, 77—94.
8. *Inside Facts About the Catholic Church*, 21 f.; quoted in *Popular Symbolics*, St. Louis, 1934, p. 155 f. Cf. F. E. Mayer, "Romanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism on Authority of the Bible," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VIII, 260 ff.
9. Waterworth, *op. cit.*, 19. This position was reaffirmed in 1870; Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 69 f. On the history of the Vulgate see *Realenzyklopaedie*, s. v., "Bibeluebersetzung"; Schaff-Herzog, s. v., "Bible Versions." The translation of the New Testament prepared in 1941 is based on the Vulgate. See Preface.
10. Geo. A. Vogel, "A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VI, 18 and especially 102 ff.
11. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, 200 ff.; 217 ff. Gibbons, *op. cit.*, VIII, 77 ff. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 59 f.
12. Cf. Waterworth, *op. cit.*, 93; 141; 154.
13. Carl Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Roemischen Katholizismus*, 173.
14. *Ibid.*, 341.
15. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 238 ff. Gibbons, *loc. cit.*; cf. Innocence III: *Quia multi defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio*. Mirbt, *op. cit.*, 173.
16. Edm. Schlink, "Die Kirche in Gottes Heilsplan," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, November 1948, 646; republished in *The Ecumenical Review*, 1949, 150 ff. Even the papal encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 1943, need not be considered the final word on Rome's doctrine of the Church, since it is not as yet established whether this encyclical is infallible.
17. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, II, 694.

18. "Does Catholic Doctrine Change?" *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. 117, 322 f. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 127. J. A. Moehler, *Symbolism, or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants*. Tr. by J. B. Robertson. London, 1906, p. 288 f.
19. Gibbons, *op. cit.*, 130.
20. Voss, Gustav, "Johann Adam Moehler and the Development of Dogmas," *Theological Studies*, September, 1943, 420—444.
21. Schaff, Philip. *Creeds of Christendom*. New York and London, Harper & Bros., II, 244 f.
22. The Vatican Council said: "Not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to another." Schaff, *op. cit.*, II, 249. Edwin A. Burt, *Types of Religious Philosophy*, Harper and Bros., New York, 1939, Ch. II, "The Catholic Philosophy of Religion." Cf. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 312 ff.
23. See A. C. Welch, *Anselm and His Work*, Edinburgh, T. & T., Clark, 1901, 72.
24. The fivefold argument for the first step is presented by Thomas in *Summa theologiae*, I, Qu. 2, Art. 3.
25. Paul M. Bretscher, "Neo-Thomism," in *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, April, 1950.
26. F. E. Mayer, "The Dogma of Mary's Assumption," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1950, p. 181 f.
27. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 484.
28. M. Mahler, *Psychology: Empirical and Rational*, Longmans, Green & Co., Preface. Wm. A. Kelly, *Educational Psychology*, Milwaukee, Bruce Publ. Co., 1938, cf. the decision of the Bible Commission, 1909, on the historicity of Genesis, Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
29. W. A. Hauber, "Evolution and Catholic Thought," *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1942, 161—177.
30. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, "*De Iustificatione*," 133.
31. On "certainty" see Pohle-Preuss, *Dogmatic Theology*, VII, 379 ff.; also George D. Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, I, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1949, 13 ff.
32. K. Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, 24; 32 f.; 42 ff.; 224 ff.

# New Testament Fellowship: A Study in Semantics

By R. T. DU BRAU

IN the seventeen passages of the New Testament which employ *κοινωνία* the associative idea is uppermost. One readily distinguishes three chief usages of the term: 1) a *common sharing* in all spiritual — and sometimes material — gifts; logically followed by 2) *mutual help* and assistance by association in contributory aid, all of which affects, and is effected by, 3) the existing intimate fellowship in the association as a divinely created and established communion of all believers in Christ.

The Hellenistic use of *κοινωνία* is at once versatile and restricted. It is versatile in its vivid shades of meaning and application. It is restricted by the Christian community to mean "the Communion of Saints," from its specific application of *communion* to the Sacrament of the Altar, to its absolute sense in the "right hand of fellowship."

This paper proposes a semantic examination of the varied but always associative use of *κοινωνία* in the New Testament. Illustrative examples will be adduced from such trustworthy papyri as have well-established readings and are without *lacunae* and from corroborative patristic literature. At times some ancient or modern translation will prove of further help in understanding the term. In no wise is the *corpus* of linguistic testimonials being exhausted in these pages, but the cases cited here are representative and of sufficient lexicological moment.

## FELLOWSHIP AS "COMMON SHARING"

St Paul establishes a basis for New Testament fellowship when he thanks God for the Philippian "fellowship in the Gospel from the first day until now": ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Phil. 1:5). His statements concerning the diffusion of the Gospel in v. 7 (ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνοῦς μου τῆς χάριτος) are anticipated here and should be read in connection with v.5. While the communion in the one true Gospel is



indeed basic, the Apostle here prepares his συγκαινωνοί for the common sharing of the Gospel and the participation in its extension. United action is based on a common possession. The object is joined to the subject by means of the prepositional phrase εἰς τό, and one can properly read "common participation in, and sharing of," the Gospel, or "union in, and uniting by," the Gospel.

There is a very fine distinction here between *communio* and *participatio*. Patristic Greek continues the thought: "How can there be any sharing (κοινωνία) if nobody has anything?" laments Clemens Alexandrinus in the 13th chapter of his *Quis Dives Salvetur*.

In the middle of the 4th century we have Cyril of Jerusalem, explaining in his five *mystagogic* catechizations the meaning of the baptismal rites to the newly baptized believers: . . . σύμβολον ἦν τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς πίστεως τοῦ χ'οῦ.<sup>1</sup>

Translated into Latin, κοινωνία becomes *communicatio* in the Vulgate, but Theodore Beza prefers *communio*. There is a divergence in the chief Romance renditions, Italian: *partecipazione*; Spanish: *comunión*; and the curious but apt French: *votre attachement à l'évangile*. Among the Germanic translations Luther's "Gemeinschaft am Evangelium" covers the original and is parallel to the exact French. This is not quite so in the Swedish, where we have "deltagande i evangelium," nor in the simple Danish "Deltagelse."

Representative English translations are illuminating as to the use of κοινωνία in this instance. The Authorized Version has "fellowship in the Gospel." The Brit. RV and the ARV agree in "fellowship in the furtherance of the Gospel." The Revised Douay Version very explicitly renders, "your association with me in spreading the gospel," and Goodspeed translates very literally, "your cooperation in the good news."

In Phil. 3:10 Paul prays that he might know "the fellowship of His sufferings," i.e., Paul esteems it an honor to be associated with Christ in His sufferings, to participate in His sufferings. He welcomes being a cross-bearer with Jesus. Here the κοινωνία entails the taking up of His cross and following Him.<sup>2</sup>

The array of translations of this passage, ancient and modern,

is rather revealing. Jerome called the fellowship of Christ's suffering the *societas passionum*, while Beza translates, *ut cognoscam eum . . . et communionem perpassionum ejus*.<sup>8</sup>

This time, the Italian<sup>4</sup> has no longer *partecipazione*, but "la comunione delle sue sofferenze." But, inversely, the Spanish now has *participación*, while the French agrees with Beza and the Italians: "la communion de ses souffrances." Here the German still has *Gemeinschaft*, but the Swedish is more precise: "delaktigheten i hans lidanden," and Danish: *hans Lidelsers Samfund*. Except for Goodspeed, who has "to share his sufferings," all English versions follow the Authorized Version.

In Philemon 6 occurs the significant phrase ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου . . . "the fellowship of thy faith." Here much depends on how the genitive is understood. Bengel viewed it as the genitive of the object when he expounded thus: "fides tua, quam communem nobiscum habes et exerces." Cremer understood it as the genitive of the subject, and wanted to read, "the fellowship to which thy faith impels." Both the nature and exercise of this fellowship are determined by a unifying principle, here by the unity of faith. Paul and Philemon share the same faith, and this common sharing compels them to common action in and by faith. This is the κοινωνία in practice.

Jerome and Beza agree here in translating *communicatio fidei*. The AV follows with "communication of thy faith." The two Romance languages closest to Latin differ here. In Italian we read, "la nostra comunione di fede"; the Spanish has "la comunicación de tu fe," and it is up to the French to come to the rescue with a clear-cut translation which is a marvel of perspicuity: "que la foi qui t'est commune avec nous est efficace," i.e., that the faith we share be effectual. "Der Glaube, den wir miteinander haben," or the sharing of our faith together, says Luther. Olaus Petri, father of the Bible in Swedish, rendered: "din delaktighet i tron" (lit., your having part in the faith). The BRV and ARV have "the fellowship of thy faith"; the Revised Rheims-Douay reads "the sharing of thy faith" and applies it to "the liberality of Philemon, inspired by his faith," in the footnote. Goodspeed departs from all traditional translations by injecting a new thought: "that they, i.e., the Christians, may effectually share your faith."



## FELLOWSHIP AS MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

The well-known κοινωνία of Acts 2:42 adds concreteness to whatever is abstract in the general term of "communion," or "fellowship." Both Jerome and Beza already sensed this when they translate *communicatio*. No doubt, they translated thus in view of the following vv. 44-45, which point out the communication of material and spiritual goods in this unique fellowship. Long before this even Pindar had used κοινοῦν and κοινᾶν for "communicate." Rom. 15:25 is a case in point where κοινωνία is definitely a "contribution" made to the saints. Hence, Bengel comments: "Fellowship — in all goods, internal and external, actions, and plans. Compare as to their resources Rom. 15:26. . . . The Christianity of all, and of each, is to be valued, not merely from divine worship, but also from daily life." In this passage, then, the κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι, etc., can be rendered literally, "to make a participation in reference to the poor," for the contributor enters into fellowship with the person aided; κοινωνία thus is the characteristic expression for almsgiving, without having changed its proper sense of *communio* into the active one of *communicatio*. It can properly mean and imply both.

Consequently, St. Paul couples κοινωνία with διακονίας in 2 Cor. 8:4, as also in 9:13; in Latin: ". . . et in omnes communicatione" (Beza), "communicationis in illos et in omnes" (Vulgate). With due allowance for the peculiarities of Vulgar Latin, St. Jerome often rendered an excellently apt translation. It is good Pauline philology to consider the participation in the good work for the saints a correct and proved semantic connotation of κοινωνία. As recently as 25 years ago, there was no known extra-Scriptural testimonial for such Pauline use of κοινωνία for "contribution," but now we have an inscription from Pogla on the Taurus (Asia Minor), where κοινωνία has the same meaning which the Apostle from Tarsus (Asia Minor) gives to the κοινωνία.<sup>5</sup> St. Paul, who did not despise classic literary devices, writes τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν (2 Cor. 8:4). This is a hendiadys and can be translated, "the grace of fellowship," i. e., the grace to be allowed to participate in mutual assistance. The εἰς (εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους) indicates the destination or direction of the communication demanded by the fellowship.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews combines κοινωνία with εὐποιΐας, "doing good" (13:16). Communicating and doing good are not only parallel Christian acts, but εὐποιΐας is an outcome of κοινωνία, and the κοινωνία is manifest in the εὐποιΐα. Attention being concentrated on this manifestation of κοινωνία, the word acquired in Patristic Greek the meaning of "something communicated," a meaning which Lutherans retain and emphasize in their Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism. The French Ostervald Version is nicely explicit: "N'oubliez pas aussi d'exercer la charité, et de faire part de vos biens . . .," which among other reasons makes the reading of the French Bible such a delight and inspiration.

#### FELLOWSHIP AS PARTNERSHIP

The *locus classicus* for an intimate, unique, Christian fellowship as a partnership in Christ, is 1 Cor. 1:9: ". . . ye were called into fellowship — κοινωνία — of his Son." To fully appreciate the import of this terminology it is insufficient to simply say *societatem* (Jerome); *communione* (Beza); or *communion* (French and Italian); or *participación* (Spanish). The full weight of the context and of Scriptural analogies will have to be brought in.

*Per contra*, the Greek student might ask, why does not St. Paul, who knew post-Homeric Greek quite well, employ μετοχή for this concept of a common partnership? Μετοχή, like κοινωνία, may cover *participatio*, as it covers *particeps*, *partem habeo*, *socius*, or even *coniunctus*, but nothing more. It lacks the unifying force, the intimacy of union, the *full* partnership, that is implied in κοινωνία. Thus, if μέτοχος had been employed, the fellowship would not have been complete, full, intimate; it would apply only to a sort of junior partnership.<sup>6</sup>

Outside the New Testament we find κοινωνία employed for the marriage relationship and in the case of a political alliance.<sup>7</sup> Theology as well as philology can no longer disregard or neglect the testimony of the papyri and the inscriptions. It is precisely the research in these two sources which freed the Septuagint and the New Testament from their philological isolation and connected them with Hellenistic popular speech. But too often classicists have rejected our sacred literature on linguistic grounds and on precon-

ceived philological prejudices. Phenomena which heretofore were brushed aside as "Semitisms" or "barbarisms" are now known to be good Hellenistic Greek, and it is now proved that the Greek *usus loquendi* frequently parallels similar usage in Hebrew.<sup>8</sup>

Paul uses μετοχή only once, viz., 2 Cor. 6:14: "for what fellowship — μετοχή — has righteousness with lawlessness? or what communion — κοινωνία — has light with darkness?" Here he seems to use κοινωνία almost reluctantly. St. Luke apparently uses μέτοχοι and κοινωνοί interchangeably. The first — 5:7 — he employs to describe the partners in the other ship; the second — 5:10 — he uses for James and John, "partners" with Simon. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, μέτοχος is used once as "fellow" and the other four times of their occurrence as "partaker."

Eusthathius of Antioch, in his criticism of Origen's exegesis of 1 Kings 28:3-25 (composed about 325—30), also shows reluctance to call a fellowship of believer with unbeliever a κοινωνία; so he puts κοινωνία in quotation marks: "κοινωνία" πιστῷ μετὰ ἀπίστου.<sup>9</sup>

Eusebius of Caesarea, who completed his *Church History* about the time of the Nicaean Council, quotes from a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria in which the latter tells of one Herakles, who weepingly reported that the heretical Baptisms had no communion whatsoever with the true Baptism of orthodoxy: . . . τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ παρὰ τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς βεβάπτιστο, μὴ τοιοῦτον εἶναι μηδὲ ὅλως ἔχειν τινὰ πρὸς τοῦτο κοινωνίαν, ἀσεβείας γὰρ ἐκείνο καὶ βλασφημιῶν πεπληρωσθαι (H. e. VII, 9).

Returning to our examination of 1 Cor. 1:9, it is now clear that this use of κοινωνία with the personal genitive denotes full fellowship with someone, including participation in his goods, in his works, in his benefits, and his blessings. That is why God is faithful, i. e., true to His promise of grace, by having called us into such κοινωνία, such intimate and complete fellowship with His Son.

The true and superior import, the *summum bonum* of the Christian *communio*, is revealed in 1 Cor. 10:16: τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία . . . ἐστίν. This is "partaking" in its most sublime relationship.

The various, but consistent, uses of κοινωνία in the New Testament combine to give us an ever-deepening grasp of the term. Its significant use by St. Paul in his benediction cannot escape us,

2 Cor. 13:13: καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. This grouping of κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος has its parallels in the κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, etc. in 1 Cor. 10:16, and the κοινωνίαν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ of Phil. 3:10. In all these cases it is the reception and partaking of the Holy Spirit, the body and blood, His suffering, etc., which makes and sustains κοινωνία.

Fellowship in the New Testament is no passive, inactive, merely contemplative thing, it is action and activity in the Gospel. This is the use to which Paul puts the word in Gal. 2:9: δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, "right hands they gave to me and Barnabas of fellowship that we to the nations (should go)." <sup>10</sup> Here is the handclasp of fellowship, seal of partnership in the proclamation of the same Gospel. Κοινωνία and κήρυγμα belong together. And in Phil. 2:1 Paul joins "consolation in Christ," "comfort of love," with the κοινωνία πνεύματος. The underlying thought is: if fellowship of the spirit is to have any effect. The unifying principle of the Christian community, of the communion of saints, is the communion of the Holy Spirit and the consolation of Christ, the παράκλησις which sends to the κοινωνοὶ of the κοινωνία the παράκλητος. This affords us a glance into the circle of eternity and its unfathomable glories. And all this in the one great word: κοινωνία! The members and partakers of the communion therefore are to be of one heart and mind, in agreement with each other; and thus they are in truth a *societas spiritus*, as Jerome calls them, and they possess, as the Epistles aptly express it in French translation, *communion d'esprit*.

Who could sum it up better than the disciple whom Jesus loved? "Fellowship with us," "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ," "fellowship with Him," "fellowship with one another," conditioned and sustained by the blood of Jesus Christ which "cleanseth us from all sin," such is the majestic manner in which St. John sums up the richness and undeserved gift of the κοινωνία into which just as undeservedly we have been called by our faithful God (1 John 1:3, 6, 7).

The κοινωνία is Christocentric in a still deeper sense: it is not only a set of common convictions and doctrines about Christ, but it is Christ fellowship. It comprises within its whole astounding semantic range the idea of participation in, and partaking of, the

blessings received from Christ and of union of all Christians with one another as redeemed by His blood and called by God into the *κοινωνία* of the Spirit. Properly do Christian people everywhere, wherever they are conscious of the uses of *κοινωνία* in the Scriptures, speak of the "communion of saints" and of the "Holy Communion." Thus from earliest times the "communion of saints" has formed one of the items of the Creed. It signifies that Christians everywhere have fellowship with God, with one another on earth, with the saints at rest. The foundation of our *κοινωνία* cannot be removed by death. Christ, who is the Life of all the living, who lives within them, is Lord both of the living and of the dead; and if I have communion with a saint of God while he lives here on earth, I must still have fellowship with him when he is departed hence, or when I depart hence, for such is the everlasting power of the New Testament fellowship.

Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. From the reading of the Codex Monacensis. F. Probst: *Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts*, p. 82 ff. — Cp. Rom. 11:17. Also: A. Baumstark: *Die Messe im Morgenland*, 1906, p. 37 ff. — The French translate *συγκοινωνός* with *participant*.
2. For a beautiful and exhaustive treatment of this theme, see CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, XV, 51 f.
3. Beza's Cambridge translation of 1582 is in a delightfully readable Latin. Our quotations are from the edition of 1642.
4. By Prof. Giovanni Luzzi, erstwhile of the Valdensian faculty in Rome.
5. *Jahreshefte des oesterreichischen archeologischen Instituts* IV, Beiblatt, p. 37 ff.
6. This is apparent from a great number of papyri. My own examination of all published papyri from Tebtunis, from the Fayum, and most from Oxyrrhynchus, dating over a period from 172 B. C. to 196 A. D., showed that *μετοχή*, *μέτοχοι*, are used always for business partnerships and associates. Among 32 instances of this sort for the period covered, we found, e. g., "Horus & Partnership," "Herod and his partner," "The Bank of Heraclides & Co.," "Bank of Theon and Associates," a "Company of Fish-packers," "Appolonius and Partners," "Sabinus & Co., dealers in wheat," and many others. In all these instances, the term employed is *μετοχή* and not *κοινωνία*.
7. A few non-Christian uses of *κοινωνία* are noted; but these would point to a more intense partnership than a mere business association. The *Berliner Griechische Urkunde* No. 1051 carries a marriage contract of the time of Augustus, where marriage is called a life partnership: *πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν*. Another instance from Augustan times is found in no less a monument than the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* in Ancyra (Angora, Galatia): *ὡς τὸ πρὶν οὐδεμία ἦν πρὸς δῆμον Ῥωμαίων πρεσβειῶν καὶ φιλίας*

κοινωνία; the Latin parallel of the text reads: "quibus antea cum populo Romano nullum extiterat legationum et amicitiae commercium" (Ehrenberg & Jones. *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberias*, Oxford, 1949, pp. 28—29). Well in the Christian era are two more secular uses of κοινωνία. It could have been possible for the contracting parties to have been Christians, and that therefore the use of κοινωνία came quite easy to them. The first is a marriage contract of the year 170 A.D.: πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν (P. Oxyr. 905, Grenfell & Hunt VI, p. 243 ff.). Another document dates from 320 A.D. and is part of the correspondence of the famous councilman Adelphios of Hermopolis, telling of a complaint regarding Zois and Ibois "and their other partners": καὶ ἑτεροὶ πολλοὶ κοινωνοί (F. Preisigke. *Griechische Urkunden des Aegyptischen Museums zu Kairo*, Strasbourg, 1911, p. 5. Kairo Mus. 10567).

8. Cp. Psichari. *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*. Paris, 1908.
9. E. Klostermann, ed. *Origenes, Eustathius von Antiochien und Gregor von Nyssa*. Bonn, 1912, p. 39.
10. Winer. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, p. 546.



## HOMILETICS

### SERVICE THEMES AND TEXTS FOR JUNE

June 3	2 S. a. Tr.	Prov. 9:1-10	(The Life of Christian Prudence)
June 10	3 S. a. Tr.	Is. 12	(God's Care for the Lost)
June 17	4 S. a. Tr.	Is. 65:17-25	(The Life of Trust)
June 24	5 S. a. Tr.	Lam. 3:22-32	(God's Blessing on Christian Witness)

### *Sermon Study on Isaiah 12 for Third Sunday After Trinity*

Isaiah, the Evangelist of the Old Testament, half way between Moses and Christ, may be said to have a message for three classes of people: to Jerusalem and Judea, his own nation, in general; to the "remnant," the *sh'erith*, the pious people, the *ecclesiola* in the corrupted national church, in particular; and finally to the people of all times. His pronouncement of judgment on sin and his calls to the impenitent to repent are as valid and certain now as then, while his words of comfort and hope to the "remnant" were meant for God's people *in genere*.

The chapter under consideration is the close of the second cycle of prophetic discourses, "the consolation of the Immanuel in the judgments," chapters 7—11, called the Book of Immanuel. It is altogether fitting that this series of prophecies should close with a doxology.

To whom are these words addressed, or rather who speaks them? Stoeckhardt in his commentary states that according to the context they are to be applied to the Church Triumphant. He is followed by Kretzmann in his *Popular Commentary* and a sermon in *The Concordia Pulpit* for 1935. However, Stoeckhardt admits that according to the words and phrases the chapter may be spoken by the Church on earth and that many older commentators have taken this position. This exposition is found in a sermon in *The Concordia Pulpit* for 1948. I associate myself with the latter view.

In the preceding chapters Isaiah has his eye on the glorious

event of the coming and reign of the Messiah. He refers to the redemption to be wrought by Christ through His suffering and death. That Christ through His death has turned the anger of God away from sinners and converted it into grace, that this work of reconciliation is now being proclaimed on earth, among all nations—this is the fulfillment of the prophecy contained in chapter 12, whose very language would indicate that it is addressed to, and sung by, the members of the Kingdom of Grace, the Church of the New Testament.

V. 1. *And in that day.* This expression found frequently in the prophets always denoted a time of the special manifestation of God's power, be it in judgment or in mercy. Here it refers to the day of mercy.

In chapter 10 the doom of Assyria has been foretold. Chapter 11 describes the kingdom and reign of Christ, David's Son, from its humble beginning ("root of Jesse") to its glorious consummation. After completing His redemptive work on earth, Christ, the mighty, reascended Lord, sitting at the right hand of God the Father, pours out His Spirit on all flesh. He plants in this sinful world a kingdom of peace and love. He gathers unto Himself a people, a holy nation, from among Jew and Gentile and protects His Church with His mighty arm against the God-hating world and will finally deliver His people from all evil of body and soul and grant them victory over all their oppressors and participation in His heavenly, divine glory.

The mighty world empire Assyria, the haughty oppressor of Israel, chapter 10, is contrasted with the spiritual kingdom of Christ, chapter 11. The former symbolizes the God-hating world, continually harassing the Christian, but whose end is destruction, while the latter offers peace and rest. The one portrays the destiny of the sinner, the other the destiny of the child of God (Psalm 1). This contrast is indicated by the connective "and," chapter 11:1. The last verse of chapter 10 states that Assur, pictured as Lebanon, "shall fall by a mighty one." This is a clear reference to David's Son, of whom the following chapter treats. "In that day," then, points to the time when Christ has established His kingdom on earth, when the work of the redemption is completed and the power of the Evil One broken, when God will bring in His people

from all spiritual scatterings, bondage, and captivity — the era of the New Testament Church.

*Thou shalt say.* Thou wilt have cause to say so. God's promise is sure, and the blessings contained in it are very rich. In that day when many are brought home to Christ, thou oughtest to say. We should rejoice over the grace of God to others as well as to ourselves.

*O Lord, I will praise Thee.* This is a common opening of a hymn of praise, especially in the Psalms (75:2; 139:14; Dan. 2:23; Matt. 11:25). *Hodab* means to praise, thank, confess, acknowledge, *bekennen*. The original connotation is to throw, cast down. One who makes a public confession of something by his words and prayers, especially one who with a loud and clear voice renders praise, may be pictured as casting praise from himself into the midst of his fellow men. Whoever truly believes in Christ cannot remain silent, but must speak (Ps. 116:10; 2 Cor. 4:13). The knowledge of the magnitude and excellence of blessings received, of the grace and mercy of God in Christ, and the conviction of one's own unworthiness opens the closed mouth to proclaim the praise of God upon every occasion and especially in the congregation of the righteous (Ps. 35:18).

*Though Thou wast angry with me.* God's anger was often against Israel because it had forsaken His ways. It is against all mankind on account of the natural depravity of men. God's anger is His holiness, which demands perfect holiness (Gen. 17:1), and His justice, which makes mandatory the punishment of transgressions. These are His attributes, His *doxa*. Even though God would have cast off mankind forever, yet his anger, i. e., His holiness and justice, would be cause for praise.

*Thine anger is turned away.* This expression appears also Job 9:13; Prov. 24:18; Ps. 68:3. It means, in a broader scope, on the one hand, deliverance from the state of guilt and consequently also from the tribulations which testify of divine wrath and displeasure; on the other hand, assurance of divine favor and grace through some manifestation. In the history of Israel, God repeatedly revealed His love to His people by liberating them from their enemies after He had given them into their hands as a punishment for their transgressions. In a narrow, or spiritual, sense God's anger has really

and truly ceased through the atonement made by Christ (Hymn 237:1). The Atonement is the sign, or token, of God's love. The emphasis is not on God's anger, but rather on its being turned away.

The jussive *yashov* has been much disputed. The margin of the Revised Version has: "Let Thine anger be turned away." However, it is quite clear that the jussive is frequently used for the ordinary imperfect form, especially in poetry, and is not due so much to poetic license as rather to the rhythm. Moreover, since the jussive in many cases is not distinguished from the imperfect, one cannot always tell which of the two the writer intended. In this case it is safe to assume that it is a defective writing of the imperfect.

V. 2. *Behold, God is my Salvation.* This may also be translated: Behold the God of my salvation. The abstract "my salvation" for the concrete "my Savior" is found frequently both in Isaiah and in the Psalms (27:1; 35:3; 118:14, 21; Is. 25:9; 33:2; cf. Ex. 15:2). Salvation means divine help, complete spiritual deliverance, used mainly in the absolute (Messianic) sense. This is the climax of the psalm of praise which Isaiah puts into the mouth of the redeemed.

What are some of the blessings which accrue to the children of God because He is their Salvation? The redeemed in our text mention two: comfort and trust. Comfort they combine with the turning away of God's anger in this way: Thine anger is turned away, *and Thou comfortedst me* (v. 1 b). This comfort relates to the experiencing of divine grace and favor, which quiets the conscience. This is an operation of the Spirit of God in the hearts of the believers (Phil. 4:7). This comfort is the hope in Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 1:8) and rests on the forgiveness of sins (Matt. 9:2), the gift of the Holy Ghost, and absolute certainty of salvation (2 Tim. 1:12).

This comfort begets trust, the second blessing. *I will trust and not be afraid.* This sentence is reminiscent of Ps. 27:1 b. *'Evtach* and *'ephchad* form a paronomasia. Trust is the characteristic Old Testament word for the New Testament "faith," "believe." It occurs 152 times in the Old Testament in various shades of meaning, e. g., "to take refuge" (Ruth 2:12), "to lean upon" (Ps. 56:3). In our passage it means to feel safe, secure, to rely on the promises of God, and this is a fruit and result of faith. Trust is a feeling of security flowing out of the knowledge of having received the adoption of

sons (Gal. 4:4). Those having such a trust are convinced in their hearts of divine grace and favor and therefore place all their hope serenely and confidently in God, to whose care they entrust themselves under all circumstances. Such assurance and confidence exclaims: "God is my Salvation—I will trust and not be afraid!" (Ps. 27:11. Rom. 8:35.)

The word here used for God is *'el*, believed by some to refer to God in His almighty, all-powerful aspect, by others as indicating God as the one true God in distinction to all other gods. The grace and love of God to sinful man revealed in the Redemption and His almighty power to save—these are the ground pillars upon which rests a Christian's trust. The Church, convinced of the truth and certainty of salvation, expresses its wonderment over the magnitude of this blessing in the word "behold."

*For the Lord JEHOVAH is my Strength and my Song.* Only four times in the King James Version have the translators retained the original name "Jehovah": here and in Ex. 6:3, Ps. 63:18, Is. 26:4. In our passage the original has *yah yehovah*. *Yah* is an abbreviation of *Yahweh*, often used for the sake of conciseness, particularly in the Psalms, e. g., "Hallelujah." In this place as well as in Is. 26:4 the name may perhaps be repeated for emphasis or to denote that Jehovah is always the same unchangeable God. In some manuscripts *Yah* is omitted in this verse, but the best manuscripts retain it.

*'Oz* means not only "strength," but also "object of praise." The glory and power of God is the object of my praise. The word may also denote strong praise. Cf. 2 Chron. 30:21: "singing with loud instruments," or, according to the American Translation (University of Chicago): [they] "praised the Lord with all their might."

*Zimrath*, a rarer feminine ending, really for *zimrathi*. The absorption of the *yodh* is not due merely to the following *yodh*, but is rather intended "to facilitate the absorption of *Yah*."

This clause is to be regarded as independent. The *ki* not being a causal conjunction connecting the clause with the previous, is to be taken in its original demonstrative sense: surely, truly. Cf. Is. 7:9; Gen. 18:20.

The verse ends with the same thought, almost the same words,

with which it began: *He also is become my Salvation*. The second part of the verse ("For the Lord Jehovah . . . my Salvation") is an exact repetition of Ex. 15:2, the triumphal song of Moses, and also of Ps. 118:14, with the exception that in these two passages the divine name occurs only once. Delitzsch calls the doubling of the name Jehovah in the Isaiah passage a *climax ascendens*, the surpassing of the type by the antitype.

V. 3. *Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation*. The Prophet interrupts the song to give the Church a comforting promise, an answer, as it were, from the Lord Himself to the prayer of the foregoing verse. "Therefore," in view of God's mercies. The Hebrew connective is a simple "and." The fullness of God's mercies and the richness of His love are often pictured in Holy Writ as fountains, rivers, streams. These refresh, cheer, sustain. The language may be figurative, but the meaning is clear. Christ Himself is the Author or Source of unending salvation (Heb. 5:9). Out of the abundance of His loving-kindness and grace He has provided a supply for the spiritual necessities of men: righteousness, wisdom, comfort, strength, victory over sin, sanctification. Whatever is required for growing in grace, strengthening of faith, and the attainment of the end of faith, namely, the soul's salvation, must all be drawn from Christ as the only Source, the Well, or Fountain, of salvation (Zech. 13:1; Is. 48:8; Jer. 2:13; Ps. 23:2; Rev. 7:17). Of significance is the plural "wells." His grace and mercy are not limited to one particular time or place, but His blessings everywhere abound and His mercies are new with every morning. As our Prophet He still reveals Himself by the preaching of the Gospel as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world. Even as God miraculously supplied the Israelites with water in the desert (Numbers 20), so the God of salvation, who has become our salvation, opens many and manifold sources (the written Word, the oral proclamation, the absolution, the Sacraments, fraternal admonition, our Catechism, hymnal, prayer-book), and the blessings flowing from them, which comfort the troubled heart and still the thirst of the sinner, are inexhaustible, endless. From this well of salvation (John 4:14b) the redeemed and all comers are enjoined to draw. This is tantamount to faith, reposing one's trust for the life that now is and for that which is to come



in Him, who is able to save to the uttermost all who come to Him. Every quiet meditation, every prayerful perusal of the sacred page, is a drawing of water. This is to be done with joy. The water is free (Is. 55:1), overflowing, refreshing, filling the soul with happiness. "Duty" can be commanded, "pleasure" cannot. A person may be made to read Scripture, but only life within will lead him to draw water with joy. We listen to music so differently when we love and delight in it. Therefore draw abundantly, even as the discovery of a well in the desert fills the heart of the thirsty pilgrim with rejoicing. The words of this verse were at the time of Christ spoken at the Feast of Tabernacles, when water was drawn in a golden cup from the fountain of Siloam as a drink offering. As the priest entered the Temple, another priest would take the cup and, pouring out the water, spoke these words in remembrance of Meribah.

This water of salvation forms the basis for the second stage of the song, vv. 4-6, which continues in the strain of a psalm of praise.

V. 4. *And in that day ye shall say.* This phrase is the same as in v. 1 except for the plural. The believers, they who have drawn from the wells of salvation, are now enjoined to invite and encourage one another to praise God. The verbs in this section are in the imperative — no longer the subjective confession of v. 1, but a demand that all participate in proclaiming Jehovah's name to the world.

*Praise the Lord.* Raise your happy voices, recounting the wonders of God. Do not be ashamed of the heavenly blessings which are yours, but rather consider it an honor to be the recipients of them (Ps. 75:1).

*Call upon His name.* The margin has "proclaim." This phrase occurs frequently. It embraces the whole exercise of religion, honoring, praising, worshiping, professing God as the sole Source of salvation (Ps. 79:6; Zeph. 3:9), and translating this faith into a conscientious discharge of one's duties to God. God, who is thus honored, in turn honors the believer by calling him His servant, His son, His people.

*Declare His doings among the people.* This phrase is a repetition of Ps. 105:1 b. *'alilah* means a bold deed, which really seems daring. The Prophet has chosen this word to express the magnitude

of the whole work of God's power and grace which He has shown in the redemption of His people. Isaiah foresees that when the Messiah shall have risen from the dead, then the prince of this world will be judged and the Kingdom of Christ established. This is to be made known among the people, all the people, *'amim*, that they may see the glory of the Father and join in His praise.

*Make mention that His name is exalted.* Hebrew: "Cause it to be remembered." God's name is God Himself, His Being, His attributes. The fact that His name is exalted is a clear proof of His divine attributes, for which men are to honor and praise Him. It is because of the great work of God's grace in His Son and His justice in meting out punishment to His enemies and the enemies of His Church that His name is exalted, worthy to be adored by all the nations of the earth (2 Sam. 22:47; Ps. 21:13; Ps. 46:10).

V. 5. *Sing unto the Lord.* These are again words from the Song of Moses (Ex. 15:21). Pour forth your hope and trust in strains of sacred song, "singing and making melody in the heart" (Eph. 5:19). The Lord here is the Covenant God, who in the gift of His Son fulfilled His promise made to Abraham and the Church. This is evident from the content of the song:

*For He hath done excellent things.* *Geuth* used with the verb "make" or "do" is ascribed to the majesty of God primarily with regard to His judgments upon the enemies of His people, through which, as King and Lord of His Church, He proves His justice and power (Ps. 93:1; Is. 26:10). Here the word refers to the greatness of the work of redemption (Ps. 77:15; Luke 1:49, 51). *This is known in all the earth.* Instead of the Pual participle *m'eyudd'ath* (Ketib) the Qere substitutes the Hofal participle *muda'ath*. The probable reason for this is that in popular parlance the former denoted an acquaintance, an intimate, who was well known. The LXX translates: "Let it be known." Isaiah here foretells that the divine work of redemption will be so great and wonderful that it shall resound throughout the whole earth (Ezek. 38:23; 39:7, 13). Thus the work of divine grace, executed by the Messiah, is known in all the world through the Word of the Gospel.

V. 6. *Cry out and shout.* *Tsa'hal*, to neigh as a horse. In a metaphorical sense it expresses an exceptional and unexpected joy or pleasure manifested by a clear and loud sound of the voice (Is.

54:1; Jer. 31:7; Esth. 8:15). In the Psalms and elsewhere in Scripture the people of God are called upon by means of this word to shout, exult, or make a noise as an expression of their joy (Psalms 148, 149; Is. 42:11).

*Thou inhabitant of Zion. Yosheveth*, an abstract idea expressed by "a feminine participle used substantivally as the comprehensive designation of a number of persons" (Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, 122 e).

The source of this great joy is expressed in the final words of the chapter: *For great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee*. The appellation "Holy One of Israel" occurs 29 times in the Book of Isaiah, thus attesting to the authenticity of this chapter, which has frequently been disputed, mainly on linguistic grounds. The name refers to the Trisagion of chapter 6. God has made the sanctuary what it is by His presence. Note the possessive. The Holy One belongs to Israel, to all His faithful followers. The Son of God has through the unmistakable signs of His gracious presence in His Church shown Himself great and wonderful and continues to do so (Ps. 76:2; 99:2).

The theme of this song of praise is "salvation," a word found twice in v. 2 and again in the following verse. Its theme is even more—God Himself, for "God is my Salvation." Along with "salvation" the leading thought is "proclamation." The theme for the particular Sunday being "God's Care for the Lost," the following outline is suggested:

#### SUGGESTED OUTLINE

1. The natural state of the redeemed (Thou wast angry with me)
2. The salvation of the redeemed (Thine anger is turned away)
3. The blessings of salvation (comfort and trust)
4. The joy of salvation (v. 3)
5. The duty of the redeemed (proclamation: vv. 4-6)

FREDERICK A. BAEPLER

## THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

### TRIBUTE TO DR. GRAEBNER

Under date of February 5 Rev. Herbert Goltzen, Oldenburg, Germany, who had participated in the first theological conference held at Bad Boll in the spring of 1948, penned the following warm tribute to the late Dr. Theo. Graebner. In translating Rev. Goltzen's almost intractable German, we were guided by the familiar rule taught us at college: "As literally as possible; as freely as necessary." Rev. Goltzen writes:

"My contact with the honored teacher of the Missouri Synod Dr. Graebner was granted me in Bad Boll in 1948. This contact left a deep impression on me. The scientific thoroughness of his lectures and his telling and potent remarks in the discussions contributed most significantly to this session. Impressive was also his rigid and unflinching loyalty to the truth of Scripture, whose witness in the Lutheran Confessions Dr. Graebner had fully mastered. The closely knit compactness of his confessionally molded theology was linked, however, with a sincere appreciation of the breadth of spiritual life, therefore also of lines of thought and experiences of faith which differed from his own. And so he could enter into a real discussion with others not merely as champion of his own thoughts, but also as a receptive listener who delighted in distilling newly gained impressions. His very obvious readiness to broaden his perspective of given areas of thought, together with his scintillating temperament, made him appear surprisingly young. How effective was also his sparkling humor, his quick and persuasive repartee, his warmhearted and truly human way of meeting one in conversations, which, in spite of one's awe of his superior intellect, immediately dispelled all feelings of fear and inferiority. I shall never forget his delightfully humorous address at the social evening toward the close of the sessions in which he described with much love and a strong dose of genuine German sentimentality his impressions of Germany. He charitably understood our changed world and preserved in his heart, owing to home influence, a picture of Germany which we ourselves, after so many bitter experiences and the destruction of our whole past with its cultural and material blessings, find it difficult to discover. Therefore it profoundly touched one to note in him as in some of his associates traits of character which, like sacred vestiges of our heritage, are now being preserved and cul-

tivated in lands far remote from the mother country and which we have all but lost after a generation of collapse and unrest. That all these rich intellectual gifts and character traits of this distinguished man were rooted in genuine piety, we all felt instinctively. . . . How much the life's work of this eminent teacher of the Church has meant for your Synod I can well imagine. A whole generation of servants of the Church is laid under obligation to him. Yet in the Church of Christ we do not speak of a 'loss' when one of its members is called home, but we rather thank the Lord for the grace which He, through the services of blessed witnesses, granted His Church. . . ."

In passing, it should be said that the Lord blessed Dr. Graebner's testimony in Europe in the hearts of many others who heard him. To Him, the Lord of the Church, be all glory, praise, and thanksgiving!

P. M. B.

#### FREEMASONRY IN ENGLAND UNDER FIRE

Materials recently received from England tell the story of the controversy in the Church of England regarding Freemasonry. The controversy was occasioned by an article titled "Should a Christian Be a Mason?" which appeared in a recent issue of *Theology*, a journal published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. The author of the article is Mr. William Walton Hannah, a former priest in charge of St. Thomas', Regent Street, London, later Rector of Balcombe, Sussex, but who at present is giving himself to study and writing. The article caused such a flurry that *Reynolds News*, a London paper, opened its columns for an airing of the issues raised by Mr. Hannah. It therefore published an article by Mr. Hannah in which he summarized his chief objections to Masonry, as well as an article by a Freemason who defends Masonry. *Reynolds News* also invited reader comment. Readers were not slow to reply. In the overwhelming number of reactions of individuals from all walks of life, Freemasonry draws the short end. The latest development in the controversy is the report that "a motion calling for an inquiry into the Craft was accepted for discussion at the Convocation of Canterbury in May." The motion to be presented to the Convocation reads as follows:

"In view of the facts that—

"1.—The usages and customs of Freemasonry, its signs and symbols, its rites and ceremonies, are officially declared to 'correspond in a great degree with the mysteries of ancient Egypt';

"2.—The innermost secret of Freemasonry, disclosed in the Royal Arch degree, is concerned with the nature of God;

"3.—The name of Jesus Christ is excluded from all Masonic rituals under the jurisdiction of Grand Lodge;

"4.—The names of certain pagan deities are pronounced with great solemnity in the Royal Arch Ritual;

"5.—According to universal Christian tradition, 'idolatry consists in worshipping God under any other conception of Him than that which is set before us in the Gospels' (Archbishop William Temple);

"6.—Many members of the Church of England enter Freemasonry without realizing its doctrinal implications:

"A Committee of the Lower House be appointed to inquire whether the theological implications of Freemasonry, as distinct from its benevolent activities, are compatible with the Christian faith as held by the Church of England, and to report."

Mr. Hannah attacks Freemasonry on the grounds that it has "a ritual based on various primitive mystery cults." He brands it as "an easy and pleasant substitute for religion." "The well-known presence of bishops and other clergymen at lodge meetings," he continues, "has lulled the apprehensions of the average non-Mason into the widely accepted belief that Freemasonry is no more than a benevolent society, full of sociability and high moral principle" (according to *Reynolds News*, February 4, 1951, No. 5,239, "Dr. Fisher [Archbishop of Canterbury] is a prominent Freemason"). Another quote from Mr. Hannah: "Freemasons may claim that these pre-Christian beliefs have much of moral value. But to revert to these shadowy types and secret mysteries of bygone centuries is to go behind Christ's back and to dishonor the Incarnation. Rome has spoken out loudly and clearly in condemnation of Freemasonry. A Methodist conference in Bradford in 1927 condemned the craft. Is the Church of England too mortally involved with the heresy to speak her mind?"

From the reactions of readers of which *Reynolds News* published almost fifty, we reproduce a few samples. C. E. M. Joad, distinguished British philosopher, tries to get out from under the controversy by observing: "Freemasonry is a harmless device for amusing men who are insufficiently grown up by introducing a little pageantry into their glamour-starved lives, helping them to feel important (for an evening) and enabling them to get away from their wives. I see no harm in it at all, but I cannot believe that it is of the slightest importance." A Scotsman from Glasgow writes: "The bigotry and intolerance of Freemasonry in Scotland has to be experienced to be believed. The country is run by a dictatorship of Freemasonry; few persons can achieve any position in life if they are outside the cult." Dr. H. S.



Box, Rural Dean of Cuckfield and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Chichester, writes: "I am convinced that Christians should have nothing to do with Freemasonry for these reasons: The innermost secret of Freemasonry (Royal Arch) is concerned with the nature of God. The name of Christ is excluded from mention in Masonic lodges. The names of two pagan deities, Baal and On, are solemnly pronounced in the Royal Arch ritual. According to universal Christian tradition, worship of God other than in the name of Christ is pagan."

The principal note struck by readers who defend Masonry is that non-Masons know nothing about Masonry though Mr. Hannah is repeatedly referred to in the materials before me as having spent three years in investigating Masonic literature. One reader writes: "It is obvious to a Mason that Mr. Hannah has never been initiated into Freemasonry. Therefore he has committed a grievous crime by writing on a subject about which he has no genuine knowledge." The same complaint has been frequently directed against Synod's Commission on Fraternal Organizations, sometimes with insulting innuendos. Nevertheless, whenever the Commission, in reply to that complaint, quoted from factual and least doctrinaire interpretations of Masonry by Masons, such as Pike, Mackey, and Gould, our correspondents in no instance challenged our statements. Except for a few whining losers, they even failed to reply.

With respect to the question whether Freemasonry is a religion or not, we take the liberty to quote the opinion expressed by Mr. Hannah (*Reynolds News*, February 11, 1951, p. 3) as well as that expressed by Mr. Ernest Beha, editor of *The Freemason* (*Reynolds News*, February 25, 1951, p. 3). Mr. Hannah writes: "Masonry claims that it is not a religion. But Lodge meetings are opened and closed with prayer and sometimes hymns, and a Royal Arch motto is: 'We have found the worship of God, O citizen of the world,' which sounds very like religion to me. A religion entirely without Christ. They say that you can believe in Christ, too, as long as you never mention His name in the Lodge. But I don't think St. Paul would have approved of that limitation, and the Christian who believes in Christ as God's supreme revelation of truth cannot regard all religions as equal in the way Grand Lodge appears to do." And here is Mr. Beha: "The primary basis of Freemasonry is admittedly religion, but it is not a substitute for any form of religious belief or divine worship, and I would emphasize, contradictorily to any suggestion that this is the case, that no masonic meeting, purely as such, is held on the Sabbath. The plain

fact of the religious aspect is that every Lodge is dedicated to God and His service—and this precept is a bridge that unites all people who believe in God and so presents a common ground for service to humanity, irrespective of class or creed, for Jews, Gentiles, Mohammedans, and Hindus alike." Comments not necessary. P. M. B.

#### THE EVANGELICAL FAITH COMES BACK

Under the heading "The Theological Trend," Prof. J. R. Mantey, head of the department of New Testament at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (Chicago), in the *Watchman-Examiner* (February 1, 1951), enumerates many indications that "the evangelical faith comes back into its own." He points, for example, to *Look* magazine (January 2, 1951), which, in an article by L. W. Gillenson, "A Religious Revival Stirs America," declares that "more people are attending regular church services and uniting with churches than ever before, and that more people are attending services and being converted in meetings conducted by Billy Graham than in services held under Dwight L. Moody or 'Billy' Sunday."

Among other "indications" that he mentions are the following: "Religious books rank among the best sellers. Favorable response to the preaching of the Gospel to men in our Armed Services is exceptional. The response to religious services in schools is most heartening. Dr. Robert A. Millikan says that, whereas only twelve per cent of older American scientists are church members, forty-four per cent of the younger scientists are church-affiliated."

Dr. Mantey marks also a noticeable "increase in a return to accepting the Bible as God's inspired revelation." In a conference of seminary professors at Green Lake, Wis., some time ago a professor who still championed "a liberal, diluted type of Christianity was found weeping in his room because he was so much alone in advocating a decadent and unsuccessful system of belief. Younger men on the faculties of these various seminaries . . . had returned to the faith of their forefathers, accepting Christ as the only Savior and the Bible as the only revelation from God."

That the return to the evangelical faith is largely sponsored by younger professors is attested by the following: "A professor in a large, well-known, non-Baptist seminary recently stated that the most orthodox members, with one or two exceptions, on the faculty of his school are young men holding Ph.D. degrees from a certain university that is anything but orthodox."

Quoting a number of recent books, in particular, some belonging

into his special field, he expresses the opinion that "the most popular of the recent books in the theological field are definitely and increasingly evangelical in their advocacy." But what is more, also "the Bible is coming back into its own." He writes: "The emphasis these days is no longer on a philosophical approach to man's problems, as it was a few years ago. But rather it is on Biblical theology, on what God has to say about man as a sinner, and on what man needs to do to find and retain God's favor."

Dr. Mantey closes his refreshing article by saying: "In view of this wholesome and prevalent trend toward the evangelical position, we can all thank God and take courage. . . . Also, the recent trend of thinking should tend to make evangelicals more patient and helpful toward those who are less evangelical, for they need our prayers more than our criticism. Since they are moving in our direction, we need all the more to be patient."

They need, however, also our kindly, sympathetic witnessing. Conservative Lutheranism, just because of its peculiar orientation to the principles of Scripture and grace, should recognize in the present theological trend to return to the Christian faith a challenge to assist those who now again seek the divine truth. Let it be our glorious mission not only to enlarge our home and foreign missions, but also to draw into theological discussions and so to the study of the divine Word whomever we may interest, at home and abroad, in the precious heritage of evangelical doctrine which is ours in a special sense by virtue of Luther's Reformation.

J. T. MUELLER

#### NEO-THOMISM ONCE MORE

Neo-Thomism was one of the topics of discussion at the Bad Boll conferences in 1949. Two of the essays devoted to this subject were subsequently published in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (October 21 and November 15, 1949). Authors of these essays were Professor Eduard Ellwein of Neuendettelsau and the undersigned (my own essay appeared also, in substance, in our MONTHLY in April, 1950). In a later issue of the *Kirchenzeitung* (July 15, 1950) Pastor Adolf Ortenburger of Germany adds a number of most significant observations to those made in the articles referred to. His article bears the title "Die kulturgeschichtlich-symptomatische Bedeutung des Neo-Thomismus." We believe the contribution by Rev. Ortenburger to be so valuable that we are submitting its most vital paragraphs. Rev. Ortenburger writes:

"The person with an optimistic bent of mind and vulnerable to mass

suggestion, especially to current 'ecumaniac' tendencies, might gain the impression that the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran Church, tired of past controversies and misunderstandings, will, within the foreseeable future, resolve the last few remaining differences which result from Rome's attachment to Aristotelian philosophy, and become reconciled. For has it not been said that the Catholic Church has preserved 'apostolic elements' inasmuch as she defends the 'absolute sovereignty of God,' teaches a 'theocentric theology,' stresses Paul's concept of 'the mystical body of Christ,' yes, even extols the 'grace of God'? And are there not at present interchanges of thought between Evangelical and Roman theologians? To all this I must reply that the Roman Church will not tolerate fraternization beyond certain limits and that those of her theologians who dare to cross that limit will meet the fate of Doellinger, Loisy, Murri, and others. Furthermore, a church which prides herself to be the 'alone-saving' and 'infallible' church, cannot grant equal status to other churches. The Roman Church indeed possesses in rare measure the gift of elastically accommodating herself to historical crises, but she never loses sight of her aim since she almost instinctively discerns the difference between essentials and non-essentials. In the last analysis, the Roman Church insists on only *one* essential: submission to the Pope. As the 'religious' Pope, Pius X indeed began his pontificate with the pious declaration 'instaurare omnia in Christo.' But 'to renew all things in Christ' meant for him to make the entire world subject to the Pope. Thus there rests on the 'absolute sovereignty of God' and the 'theocentric theology' promoted by the Roman Church an ominous twilight which disturbs one all the more when one remembers that it was Thomas who said 'quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis.' Thomas demands this submission from the states and princes. Being under the sovereignty of the vicar of Christ, they should fulfill their highest calling, that is, be concerned about the preservation of peace. If a prince neglects this supreme duty, the Pope has, according to Thomas, the right to release his subjects from their oath.

"Luther's position regarding popery is well known. Yet we need to remember that Luther formed his opinion of popery not as a result of his contacts with worthy or unworthy successors of St. Peter. He knew well enough that even a pope could not be expected to be perfect. Luther rather saw in popery the embodiment of antichristian forces. For him the antichristian element in popery lies in the fact that 'the Pope has wished to be called the supreme head of the Christian Church by divine right. Accordingly he had to make himself equal

and superior to Christ and had to cause himself to be proclaimed the head and then the lord of the Church, and finally of the whole world, and simply God on earth, until he has dared to issue commands even to the angels in heaven' (*Smalcald Articles*, Part II, Art. IV, 12; see *Triglöt*, pp. 474—75). What Luther here says is historically true.

"In his theological system, Thomas also finds a place for the manner in which heretics are to be dealt with. For him heresy is deserving of death. He bases his argument on Tit. 3, 10: 'A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject.' The Roman Church, as is well known, made most effective use of this argument, particularly in Spain and France, where thousands of 'heretics' were burned at the stake. Whoever wishes to study in detail the inhuman brutalities perpetrated by the Roman Church, let him read Ranke's *History of the Popes*, the sections dealing with the Counter Reformation, or the monograph *The Counter Reformation in Silesia* by Heinrich Ziegler. The Rome pictured here is the true Rome.

"Also the concept of 'grace' in Thomistic theology is not synonymous with the Biblical concept of grace and with that current in the churches of the Reformation. In Neo-Thomistic theology, 'grace' is not the pardoning love of God, but a *habitus*, a quality in man. It is regarded as a substance, as the term 'gratia infusa' suggests, a stuff which, operating like medicine, transforms man. Thomas writes: 'Deus infundit aliquas formas seu qualitates supernaturales, secundum quas suaviter et prompte ab ipso moveantur ad bonum aeternum consequendum.' He therefore indeed maintains the necessity of grace but regards it as a 'donum superadditum.'

"This concept of 'grace' as a mysterious physical stuff and force and as a communication of 'real' ('dinglich') rather than 'ideal' gifts is most evident in Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*. In this work, the term 'grace' occurs at least hundred times, but always either in the most general sense of God's kind disposition or in the specific Catholic sense of a supernatural gift poured into the soul, as one can gather from the following expressions and judgments: God's grace and comfort, God's grace and friendship, grace and freedom of the children of God, grace and love, goodness and grace, rich in God's grace and virtue, the grace of devotion, infused grace, grace shuns all evil appearance, grace rejoices in labor, grace does not cling to temporal things, grace loves also the enemies, grace is a supernatural light, etc.

"With reference to Thomas' doctrine of the sacrifice in the mass, his classical statement 'hoc sacramentum dicitur sacrificium, in quantum



repraesentat ipsam passionem Christi' flatly contradicts the formulation of the Tridentine Council (Sess. XXII): 'Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Dei verum et proprium sacrificium — anathema sit.' And, so the declaration of the Council continues, the sacrifice is brought 'non solum pro vivorum fidelium peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus, sed et pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis.' The sacrifice in the mass is therefore interpreted to be an expiatory sacrifice in the literal sense of the term. Roman theology thus finds itself in the embarrassing situation of being committed to the Tridentine interpretation of the mass and at the same time paying homage to its greatest teacher, Thomas, who spiritualized the sacrament. On the other hand, Rome may be said to be in the fortunate position of rescuing its dogma of the mass by surrendering it and spiritualizing it in a way which would have satisfied even the Zwickau prophets and Enthusiasts.

"But now let us cast a glance at the cultural and historical features of Thomism. That is, let us place Thomas into that larger context of thought and culture which he, too, represents. In Thomas scholastic thought and theology reached its zenith. This phenomenal development of classic scholasticism had its source, however, outside the Medieval Church and its theology. It was the result of the so-called 'Renaissance,' a movement which introduced completely new areas of knowledge and whose basis was the philosophy of Aristotle known until that time almost exclusively because of his works on logic. Although indeed some radical opponents of ecclesiastical Christianity employed weapons forged by Aristotle in order to crack and undermine the foundations of the faith of the Church, a serious threat to medieval Christianity was hardly thinkable since the hierarchy in the days of Innocent III was not only externally, but also intellectually at the peak of its power. Furthermore, medieval schoolmen soon noted that what the rediscovered Aristotle had offered both formally and in terms of content especially in such neutral areas of thought as natural science, psychology, metaphysics, and ethics, could well be employed for the purpose of confirming and methodically supporting convictions which they shared with him. The result was that Aristotle, this Greek pagan, whom Luther was destined to call the 'most impudent slanderer and most wily deceiver of spirits' was placed alongside John the Baptist, the 'praecursor Christi in gratuitis,' as the 'praecursor Christi in naturalibus.'

"This leads to another development in Thomism of which not only church history, but also the history of culture in general must take



note. It is the extravagant, almost idolatrous veneration shown Thomas in the Roman Church. To begin with, let me call attention to some of the sugary epithets heaped on Thomas. He is known as 'doctor angelicus,' 'doctor universalis,' 'doctor ecclesiae,' 'angelus scholae,' 'pater ecclesiae,' 'alter Augustinus,' all epithets which can do no one any good whoever he might be. In the great Paris edition of 1560, one reads the following dedication: 'Aeternae sapientiae voci, splendidissimae trinitatis oraculo, incarnati verbi splendori, angelorum socio,' etc. In the same edition Thomas is called *sol, luna, lumen, decus, gemma, fons, flos, princeps, sanctissimus inter doctissimos, doctissimus inter sanctos* . . . 'in theologia nullus sublimior, in mathematica nullus acutior, in philosophia nullus profundior, in logica nullus subtilior, tacente Thoma mutus Aristoteles. Tolle Thomam, et dissipabo ecclesiam. Thomas est splendidissimus athleta catholicae fidei, clypeus militantis ecclesiae, ensis, quo hydrae amputantur, ignis, quo, ne succenseant, consumuntur. Omnes haereses ante se et post se profligavit, solus sufficit ad tuendum. Tot miracula, quot articulos fecit. Aenigmata dissolvit, nodos rescindit, fallacias eludit, nubes obscuras resolvat.' But worse than that. Thomas is placed on a level with St. Paul. In the wake of his passing, signs and miracles were said to have taken place. The story of the superstitious treatment of his remains and the distribution of various parts of his body is so offensive and in violation of one's sense of propriety that my pen refuses to record it. An interesting painting of the fifteenth century in the Louvre in Paris shows Thomas enthroned between Aristotle and Plato, rays of the sun emanate from his breast, and a legend underneath says: 'Vere, hic est lumen ecclesiae.' We Evangelical Christians know only one who could say: 'I am the Light of the world.' That any one teacher in our Church—and we, too, have had teachers of great stature—should be venerated as Thomas is venerated, is for us a perfectly unthinkable thought.

"Nevertheless, infractions noted above are harmless compared with the endeavor of the Roman Church to bind the consciences of people to the end of time to the philosophic and theological views of a man who lived in the thirteenth century. At this point one may even disregard completely the errors in Thomas which the Roman Church shares with him to this day. The fact is that soon after his death the teachings of Thomas became canonical for the Occidental Church, and again and again Rome declared his teachings to be the norm of knowledge and the salvation of society. Even Leo XIII declared in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris Unigenitus* (August 4, 1879) scholastic

philosophy and especially the teachings of Thomas to be the foundation of all theological studies in schools and seminaries from which no one could be permitted to deviate. Pius X solemnly confirmed the proclamation of Leo XIII. Yet these decrees fly in the face of all cultural development, for, as anyone can know, philosophic systems replace one another with such rapidity that, what is affirmed in one century, is denied in the next. Yes, even at their birth, the twins known as Thomism and Scotism were hostile to each other like Esau and Jacob.

"The question arises: Why does the Catholic Church cling so tenaciously to the teachings of Thomas? This will become clear to us as we endeavor to understand Neo-Thomism from the point of view of its cultural significance. Neo-Thomism may be understood to be either a thorough repristination of Thomism or an adaptation of Thomism to the most characteristic features of a given period. A Neo-Thomistic tempest has repeatedly broken loose on the world. The fifteenth century, for instance, witnessed such a return to Thomism induced by the dissolution of scholasticism resulting from the dangerous advances of humanism and renaissance. We understand humanism to be, in general, a resurgence of interest in Greek and Latin antiquity including its highly developed languages. Humanism is part of the so-called renaissance, that is, of the rebirth of classical antiquity and its influence on the arts and sciences, literature, society, conventions and customs, and an emphasis on the individual's personal freedom. Renaissance and humanism developed differently, however, in Germany than in countries like France and Italy. One need think only—not to mention Erasmus and Reuchlin—of the combination of humanism and the Gospel as represented in Melanchthon, whereas in Italy knowledge of the classical languages was frequently misused for the purpose of assigning mythological names to objects and persons of the Christian faith. In the Italian renaissance and humanism, God is called 'Zeus Kronion' or 'Jupiter optimus maximus.' Christ becomes 'Apollo,' the Holy Spirit 'Zephyr,' and the Virgin Mary 'Pallas,' or 'Niobe,' or 'regina sacra potens Olympi.' And how did Boccaccio describe Easter? It is for him the day 'on which man celebrates the glorious return of the son of Jupiter from the spoiled kingdom of Pluto.' In a tribute to a Christian advanced in years, Boccaccio writes: 'May he, when he leaves this earth, joyfully participate in the banquets of the gods.'

"Yet all this is harmless alongside the violations of moral principles which the spirit of the renaissance tried to justify on the grounds that it was a 'rebirth for freedom.' It was not the new man

who was born. It was not a regeneration through divine grace. It was not the 'freedom of the Christian man' extolled by Luther. On the contrary, this 'rebirth' was no more than the uninhibited exhibition of man's natural and sinful impulses. Man was encouraged to live out his life without giving undue attention to moral checks and balances. Even Jakob Burckhardt, who certainly was sympathetic to the whole renaissance movement, admitted that in the Italian renaissance marriage was violated more frequently and more deliberately than elsewhere. What concerns us, however, chiefly is the fact that the renaissance man also attacked the irrational and offensive developments in the Roman Church. Together with its superstitions, he also threw overboard faith and endeavored, in opposition to the artificial limitations placed on life and the false renunciation of life advocated by the Church, an unqualified and therefore equally objectionable affirmation of life.

"The reply of the Roman Church to the attacks made by the renaissance was Neo-Thomism. In fact, Neo-Thomism has invariably been the reply when the Roman Church believed itself threatened in its innermost existence. Let us concentrate on the modern period. The syllabus of Pope Pius IX of 1864 and the encyclical *Quanta cura* dated December 8, 1864, represent a general condemnation of modern culture and the modern state. Both appeared at a time when modern science was proudly raising its head. It was the time when science believed it could, with the help of Darwinism, solve all riddles of the universe without God and the Church. But it was in particular the syllabus of Pius X *Lamentabili* dated July 3, 1907, and the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* dated September 8, 1907, which were a trumpet blast against 'modernism' and which urged the study of Thomas as the antidote against the destructive errors of the day. The Protestant reader might almost gain the impression that the Pope had directed himself against German theology as such. Yet the syllabus addressed itself to 'inter catholicos non ita paucos scriptores, qui praetergressi fines a Patribus ac ab ipsa Sancta Ecclesia statutos altioris intelligentiae specie et historicae considerationis nomine eum dogmatum progressum quaerunt, qui reipsa eorum corruptela est.' And the encyclical declares that it is addressing itself to enemies within the family, to a large number of Catholic priests and laymen who, though protesting their love for the Church, lack a solid philosophical and theological training and are presuming to introduce reforms into the Church. Therefore 'Hannibal ante portas!' had already

in the guise of 'reformed' Catholicism penetrated into the very sacred precincts of the Catholic Church.

"But what is the real point at issue against which modern Neo-Thomism is reacting? It is Rome's fear of the researches of modern science and of the historical method. . . . In opposing this modern movement, the Roman Church has, in addition to Thomas, nothing to offer except coercive measures, police regulations, vigilance committees, the Index, strict censorship, 'non-imprimatur,' etc. No one, of course, resorts to final measures unless he is persuaded that it is a case of 'to be or not to be.' The encyclical issued by Pius X and referred to above, however, openly and repeatedly declares: The opponents are determined to destroy the power of the Church and thus the kingdom of Christ; therefore 'procul, procul esto a sacro ordine novitatum amor!' Whether Rome will be able, by resorting to coercive measures, to hold its fort, only the future can tell. But her threats prove the spiritual bankruptcy of the Roman system. They also mean that the Pope no longer has faith in the power of Catholic Christianity to overcome scientific 'modernism' through scientific theological research. Therefore he seeks refuge behind, and support from, Thomas. However, if the colossus stands on feet of clay, then the Church indeed has reason to fear every stone which might touch its feet. Therefore every appearance of Thomism in history is a call to arms, a symptom that the Roman Church feels itself threatened in its nerve center, and, to say it concretely, a declaration of war against the freedom of scientific, especially of historical, research.

"One word in passing. In the background of Neo-Thomism lies the question of faith and knowledge. This question is not solved by Thomas, who sets up the axiom that there is no disagreement between the natural and supernatural knowledge of God, because for him the axioms of thought and the mysteries of faith stem from the same God. Yet the Scriptures clearly state: 'Natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' Nevertheless, the difficult problem of a 'Christian philosophy' may be deserving of a special investigation."

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

#### AN INSPIRING MISSION TALE

Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (February 3, 1951), narrates the following gripping mission story:

M. [Monsieur] Charles Cook died last September from a wound in the head received three years before when he was chaplain in

the French army, for he was French although bearing an English name.

His mission field was at Aures in the Saharan Atlas Mountains. His mission folk were the Chaouias, 80,000 of them, living in extreme poverty, such poverty indeed that they were despised by all other North Africans. Their language had no relation to Arabic and contained few Berber words. It is perhaps a corruption of the Punic of Hannibal's day, never reduced to writing, or possibly some old dialect coming from Palestine or Persia. No one knows.

A most unattractive field, yet M. Cook chose it for his life testimony. As he and his wife could not live in the mountains, they settled for eight years in the little garrison town of Baina, some twenty kilometers from the field proper. Thence M. Cook made solitary expeditions, pack on back, preaching the Gospel everywhere to any who would listen. Few these were at first. "God? There is none; we believe nothing; we do not care to listen." In time he spoke the Chaouia dialect so well that he was even suspected of being a renegade from the Chaouia people.

In winter he traveled on skis, which seems strange for North Africa, but the snows are deep in the Atlas Mountains. Finally, by a providential turn, the only stone house in Menaa, the capital of Aures with its 3,500 inhabitants, came into his hands, and he was able to move there. In winter it was often hard to get supplies through, because of snow blockades. Because of his relief work, the people became more receptive. Their confidence was won. He was their poor man's advocate. They consulted him on all sorts of matters and often followed his advice.

Things were brightening, and the days of harvest seemed in sight. Then came the war. M. Cook was mobilized. The wound he received brought on multiple fainting spells, to which he finally succumbed. His hope of an abundant ingathering was not realized. He was at any rate another faithful witness, welcomed into the joy of the Lord. The ingathering will yet come, someday.

It is well for us to note such heroic, self-sacrificing mission efforts when the little daily worries of our own sheltered life sometimes appear to us as overwhelmingly great. And what a tale to tell to the young men who go out into foreign service to minister to the Lord's elect under difficult circumstances!

In the same "survey" Dr. Gordon, by the way, reports the founding of the first university in Uganda by the government. One of its instructors will be Carey Francis, a direct descendant of the pioneer missionary to India, William Carey. There is an initial student body of two hundred, largely drawn from mission schools. J. T. MUELLER

## THE MCCOLLUM DECISION: THREE YEARS AFTER

*America* (February 24, 1951) affords its readers an overview of what happened to the McCollum decision since it was made three years ago. It says (quoted in part):

"The most significant news to report on the third anniversary of the McCollum decision, outlawing 'released time' religious instruction on public school premises, is this: In no 'court of record,' i.e., in no court above the municipal and county level, has that decision been applied as the controlling precedent."

The nearest approach to such an application, it next states, occurred in California on April 29, 1950, when the Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit disallowed the claim of some Jehovah's Witnesses. They contended that a California property tax (California being the only State which taxes church property) violated their religious liberty. The court rejected this claim on the ground that California could levy a tax on religious goods and religious literature because the State provided police and fire protection for such religious commodities. At the end of their opinion the judges noted that if the State were to provide this protection gratis, without levying taxes in payment therefor, it would be using public funds to "support" religion, in violation of the McCollum decision.

Even in dissenting opinions, the report proceeds, no Federal and only three State judges have invoked the McCollum doctrine. Justice Wolfe of Utah's State Supreme Court invoked it on July 24, 1948, in a decision involving a large grant of State money to Mormons (Am. 7/2/49, pp. 398—99). Justices Adel and Wenzel likewise invoked the McCollum doctrine in a "dismissed time" religious instruction case which was decided against them in the Appellate Division, Second Department of the New York State Supreme Court, on January 5, 1951.

The McCollum decision, according to the report, has been considered as a *possible* precedent in only three other cases. New York Supreme Court Justice Di Giovanna, in a decision rendered June 19, 1950, pointed out eight features of New York's system of "dismissed time" (commonly known, however, as "released time") religious instruction which distinguished it from the Champaign, Ill., system outlawed in the McCollum decision. The Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey on October 17, 1950, unanimously upheld the State law requiring "that a portion of the Holy Bible known as the Old Testament shall be read, or caused to be read, without comment, in each public school classroom. . . ." The law also permits the "repeating of the Lord's Prayer."



Even in Illinois, according to *America*, the decision was invalidated, for there the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois early in 1950 invalidated an Illinois statute granting great discretion to judges in divorce, annulment, and separate-maintenance proceedings. Among many reasons given for this decision one was that permitting judges to call in religious counselors ran afoul of the McCollum decision. The McCollum decision was applied, but not as the "controlling precedent" for the decision as a whole.

As time goes by, the article says, misgivings over the McCollum decision multiply. In a recent issue of the *Illinois Law Journal*, for example, Robert Fairchild Cushman, professor of political science at Ohio State University, stated that more confusion than clarity was added to our constitutional law by the Everson (1947) and McCollum (1948) decisions. He declared: "Religion does and should, as a part of the public, share in the benefits extended to the public in general," and "to hold otherwise is to adopt a position which would permit the State to make religion an outlaw having no rights which the State is bound to protect." In view of the confusion created by the decision, law students urge clarification. Still the future is uncertain. The article closes with the following words: "Late in February the parties of the New Jersey case involving the reading of the Bible and the recitations of the Lord's Prayer will file their briefs asking for Supreme Court review. If the high court accepts jurisdiction, it will have to pass on the constitutional validity of the long-standing American tradition of allowing passages from the Bible to be read, without comment, in the public school classrooms. The McCollum thesis will be directly at issue. The Court will have either to admit its previous error or defy the verdict of most legal experts that the McCollum decision went too far."

J. T. MUELLER

#### ROME AND THE HOLY YEAR

*America* (February 10, 1951) reports on the benefits which the "twenty-fifth and greatest jubilee," coming to an end by the closing of the "holy door" on Christmas Eve, 1950, brought to the Church and the world. It admits that no man can say whether the Holy Year was in fact the "occasion for the great infusion of grace in men's souls," for "that must be left to God's providence," but to some extent men can evaluate at least the "external manifestations of grace."

Which were they? To Rome, a "huge, sprawling city," "spreading rapidly out into the Campagna," there came an estimated number of "more than two million pilgrims." It is definitely known that 736,626

"foreigners in general" spent 3,099,233 days in Rome. There were definitely 137,734 Americans in Rome who spent 506,433 days in the Holy City. What "stood out," as one viewed these pilgrims, was "the very evident faith and hope of the pilgrims, rich and poor alike."

The 137,734 Americans, spending 506,433 days in Rome, spent a minimum of \$10 a day, which means that they left at least \$5,000,000 in the Holy City. Other foreigners may not have spent quite as much as did the Americans, but also their financial contributions were no doubt considerable.

Most of the money, as the article says, was received by the hotel owners and the merchants, especially the religious goods stores. We may add that the contributions at the various churches and charities seemed to be large, and it is certain that the numerous beggars in Rome received a gratifying share of the contributions.

The papal audiences were of course the chief center of attraction, as the writer rightly remarks. Twice a week for most of the year the Pope received 30,000 to 40,000 people in the Basilica, in addition to morning schedules of private and semiprivate audiences. During the summer months at his residence at Castel Gandolfo, he received thousands of pilgrims every day. Sometimes the courtyard was filled twice a night, and it holds 5,000. St. Peter's Square was filled on Easter Sunday; on the feast of Corpus Christi, for the canonization of St. Maria Goretti; and for the definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin on All Saints' Day. The Square and the adjoining Via della Conciliazione hold about 135,000 people. Numerous other appearances of the Holy Father took place at various times and at various places, and all were attended by large numbers of people.

During the Holy Year, Rome was host to a number of conventions, of philosophers, doctors of medicine, doctors of theology, and so forth. In September alone there were ten international congresses, the attendances at which were large.

Speaking of the many pilgrims and their evident piety, the writer says: "It just does not seem consonant with our idea of God's love for us that He could forbear to pour great graces into the hearts of the many people who have shown this year their real efforts, despite all their difficulties, to love Him more."

As one who spent some time in Rome during the last summer the undersigned would remark that he finds the general tone and tenor of the report very sober. Rome was attended by many pilgrims even in the oppressive heat of the summer, and for the greater part they seemed serious, especially those that came from Germany and Austria. But

we might add to the article a number of other things that seem important.

On the whole, the Italian—or, let us say, Roman—populace did not take the Holy Year very seriously. While in general they received the visitors in a friendly way, there was noticeable everywhere the spirit of mundane gaiety, money making, and, wherever there was an expression of piety, of formalism. The Pope very wisely warned the pilgrims not to be offended at what they saw or heard at Rome, a warning which seemed quite necessary at times.

But there was more. Rome is a city of contrasts also in religion. While there was bigoted piety, there was also evident rebellion against the Church, and Communism in places and at times did not conceal its abhorrence of the superstition manifested in so many ways.

For the Lutherans and other Protestants the Holy Year was one of deep study of the fundamental difference between Rome and Wittenberg. Numerous articles in English, German, Austrian, and other European periodicals appeared in which the greater cleavage between Romanism and Protestantism, produced especially by the definition of the Assumption of Mary, was almost vehemently stressed. Thus Rome's glory became her shame, for evangelical Christianity was made to realize that the "holy year," with the offensive dogma in which it culminated, was a new disavowal of Christendom's fundamentals: the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia*, and so a new and definite repudiation of the Reformation.

J. T. MUELLER

#### REPEAL AFTER TWENTY YEARS

The *Christian Century* (February 14, 1951) contains an article under the given heading which draws a terrifying picture of the tragic effects of the abuse of alcoholic beverages upon thousands in our country. One instinctively feels that here all Christian citizens should work together for law and order against the criminal elements that ply the lawless liquor trade to the physical and spiritual ruin of countless numbers of young and old people in our land. A few sentences quoted at random will suffice to depict the horror of the situation. We read:

"When the Prohibition Amendment was repealed in 1932, the Administration and the liquor trade agreed with the prevailing sentiment of the time that under repeal there would be much less drinking and crime due to drinking. After almost twenty years' experience, let us impartially and factually review the evidence. The record is to be found in the courts, hospitals, homes, and industries of the nation."

The following paragraph is a good summary of the harm that has

been done, and is still being done, by the wholesale abuse of alcoholic beverages:

"There are now 482,000 legal retail liquor outlets in the country. The best estimates indicate that there are 50 million people above voting age who drink and that of this number 10 million are heavy drinkers. These figures are the highest in our history. According to the Department of Commerce, Americans are spending about \$9 billion a year for alcoholic beverages. This compares with \$2 billion spent in 1932. In 1933 the per-capita consumption of alcoholic beverages was 1.69 gallons. In 1947 it was 27.25 gallons. FBI figures show that during these twenty years of repeal, arrests for drunkenness increased 197 per cent. Arrests for driving while intoxicated increased 122 per cent. Arrests of women for drunkenness increased fivefold. In one city, Los Angeles, arrests for drunkenness in proportion to population increased 14 fold during this period."

Equally horrifying is the picture which the writer paints of the rule of gangsters in connection with the destructive liquor trade. He says:

"Prohibition was roundly condemned because it fostered gangsters and racketeers like Al Capone. Twenty years after, we have syndicates of goons and lobbyists in operation that make the old Capone mob look like amateurs, and the new Capone mob has added some tricks to its bag. These extensive criminal operations are supported by legal and illegal liquor. Their lawless threat is so great that a number of newspapers recently began to report the situation, and the United States Senate has set up a crime commission to investigate it. This body has cited, with documentation, the case of Charles Binaggio of Kansas City (lately murdered), a racketeer politician who was 'second only to Governor Smith in Missouri political circles. . . .'

"California's Governor Warren has said that in that State a man by the name of Arthur H. Samish has more power than the Governor on matters that affect his clients. Samish himself boasts that he is the governor of the Legislature. Who is this secret boss of one of our greatest States? He is the legislative lobbyist of the California State Brewers' Institute. . . .

"Then there is Frank Costello. Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, president of the American Municipal Association, representing the governments of 9,500 cities and towns, declares that the nation-wide crime syndicate headed by Costello is so powerful that it threatens to take over the government of several of the nation's key cities. . . .

"Bootlegging was supposed to pass out of the picture with legalized drink. However, the Florida crime commission records show that there

was never a year under prohibition when as many bootleggers were arrested as have been arrested each and every year since. And the Chicago Juvenile Protective Association reported that 66 per cent of all complaints it received concerned illegal conditions in places selling liquor.

"On the other hand, it is the legal sale of alcoholic beverages that causes most trouble for the law-enforcement people. The final report of the Los Angeles grand jury for 1948 stated: 'Our jails and prisons are crowded; our courts and police organizations are burdened; our law-enforcement and social-welfare problems are seriously aggravated because of the licensed liquor traffic. . . .'

"Similar reports come from every section of the country. The last State to analyze the cost of alcohol was Massachusetts. . . . It [the report] showed that 50 per cent of the felonies and 85 per cent of the misdemeanors are due to alcohol. Insanity caused by alcohol cost the State \$4 million a year; crime caused by alcohol cost \$6 million a year. The cost of financial dependence on charity caused by alcohol was \$51 million a year. The care of chronic alcoholics alone cost the State \$61 million a year, or 4.5 times the State revenue from liquor taxes.

"Mayor Martin Kennelly of Chicago says that 80 per cent of all cases sent to the Chicago lockups involve alcohol. City Judge George J. Grellner of St. Louis reports: 'Excessive drinking is responsible for most of the crime, broken homes, business failures, and juvenile delinquency in St. Louis. . . .' Judge John J. King of Columbus, Ohio, stated that 80 per cent of the crimes there were committed under the influence of drink. In Washington, D.C., 14,000 out of the 19,000 arrests made in 1949 were for drunkenness."

And so the story goes on. The question is: What can we who are Christian citizens do to assist our lawful Government to fight this wave of perdition which comes from the frightful abuse of liquor in our country? Congregations and pastoral conferences might do well to give this matter due attention in connection with their duty to "seek the peace of the city" (Jer. 29:7).  
J. T. MUELLER

#### HOW THEY GET THAT WAY

Roman Catholics tell us that they agree with many of our teachings and regard some practices in the Catholic Church to be superstitious hocus-pocus, but that they are bound in their consciences to continue their affiliation with the Church in which they were born and reared. Though we cannot agree with them, we can at least understand their position. For we must remember that it is dinned into the minds and

hearts of Catholics from childhood days forward that the Catholic Church is the "only-saving" Church, that it was instituted by Christ, that it originated on Pentecost Day, and that Peter was its first Pope. What else can the Catholic layman brought up in this climate of thought conclude except that all other Christian churches are heretical bodies which ought to return to the mother Church. The argument advanced in Catholic thought runs about like this: "The Christians of the first century were all Catholics; Peter, Paul, the Christians in Jerusalem, etc., lived in the first century; therefore Peter, Paul, the Christians in Jerusalem, etc., were Catholics." And so one appreciates the dilemma in which the good Catholic neighbor finds himself who, though not blinded by the external glamor of his Church and occasionally displaying a genuine interest in Protestant teachings, nevertheless decides to stay with his Church on the grounds that, after all, it is the oldest Church, that it has the longest tradition, and that, therefore, the chances that it is Christ's true Church are at least ten to one.

Of course, the Catholic Church has propagated this egregious distortion of historical truth since the early Middle Ages. But only in modern times has it used all available means to propagandize this error. There is a reason for this propaganda. This teaching is basic in her whole system. Deny that the Catholic Church was instituted by Christ, that the Catholic Church as we know it originated in the first century, that Peter was the first Pope, and the foundations of the Catholic system begin to crumble. But does the Roman Church really teach all this in our day? Well, here are two little booklets, published for the Paulist Press by Gerald C. Treacy, S. J., which supply the evidence. The booklets carry the title "Bible Stories for Children" and in very simple language trace the content of the Book of Acts. Here are a few choice gems from these booklets. "St Peter, who was head of the Apostles and the first Pope, heard the whisper" (Acts 2). . . . "The people said to St. Peter, 'Give us baptism, we believe in the Catholic Church founded by Christ.'" . . . "The people who were baptized on Pentecost were the first Catholics. And they were good Catholics, too, learning the catechism from the Apostles and saying their prayers and going to Holy Mass and Holy Communion every day. These first Catholics lived like one big family" (Acts 2). . . . "Five thousand became Catholics after St. Peter had finished speaking" (Acts 4). . . . "When the Apostles at Jerusalem heard that so many people of Samaria had been baptized, they decided to send St. Peter and St. John to that city to give the people Confirmation. When



St. Peter and St. John got to Samaria, they called all the Catholics together. . . . This is how the first Catholics of Samaria were given the Sacrament of Confirmation" (Acts 8). Referring to the death of Herod (Acts 12), the author writes: "As he fell, a great number of worms came up out of the ground, climbed all over his outstretched body, and began to eat it. 'This is how he died because he did not honor God,' are St. Luke's words as he finished the first part of the Story of the First Catholics. It is a book called the Acts of the Apostles. It is the record of the Catholic Church in its first years."

A few more samples from the manner in which the life of Paul is presented. "Sergius Paulus was the first Proconsul of the Roman Empire to become a Catholic" (Acts 13). . . . "So the delegates went down to Antioch and calling all the Catholics to a meeting, delivered the letter to them. On reading the letter, the Antioch Catholics were delighted and encouraged" (Acts 15). . . . "When they reached Derbe and Lystra they met a man named Timothy whose mother was a Jewish Catholic. Timothy went along and did great things for the Church as a priest and a bishop" (Acts 16). . . . "Wherever they went on their travels they told the people the story of the Council of Jerusalem and what had been decided upon in regard to the Gentiles. The Council was the first ever held in the Church. The last Council was held in Rome in 1870 and is called the Vatican Council" (Acts 15). . . . "Lydia said to Paul, 'Now that you know that we are all Catholics, come into my house and stay here'" (Acts 16). . . . "When Paul and Silas left Philippi, they had a nice reunion with all the Catholics" (Acts 16). . . . "While at Troas one Sunday, Paul decided to give a very long sermon after he had offered Mass for the people. . . . At Troas, all the Catholics were gathered together in an upper room on the third story of a house where they always met for Holy Mass" (Acts 20).

Say it often enough, say it loudly enough, and people will believe you. Hitler knew the secret, Stalin knows the secret, modern advertisers over radio and television know it. But no one has mastered the trick of having people believe what you want them to believe so successfully as the powers that be in the Catholic Church. The antidote? Support of our pastors, development of our system of higher and parish education, more Christian literature, a more genuine interest in Lutheran theology, more fervent prayer, and, above all, more preaching of Christ and His Word as we know it from the Holy Scriptures.

P. M. B.

## BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

Yale Divinity School has adopted a new "tailor-made" curriculum designed to fit students to individualized ministries. The new study program is an attempt to break away from the trend toward seminary "core" curricula or general education. Yale is introducing its new curriculum in order to put emphasis on various forms of specialized services, including the rural ministry, the ministry to industrial workers or to college students, and religious journalism. In order to achieve this fundamental reorganization, the entire three-year Bachelor of Divinity course of study has been divided into four major areas in which students can choose from a total of more than 150 courses. The first major area of study aims at giving the student a good knowledge of the Bible; the second provides a study of the history and teachings of the Christian Church; the third is devoted to an investigation of the character, culture, and social institutions of the people to whom the students will minister; the fourth comprises special group study to give students skill as competent workmen in a particular church vocation. First-year students work in the four major areas of the curriculum for a general grounding in theology and toward the end of the year will be required to take a course in "Varieties of the Christian Ministry," the last half of which will be devoted to vocational counseling. Only students who demonstrated adequate promise will be admitted to the second-year class and will be expected to elect a major in one of six prescribed vocational groups and present a written proposal of their program for the second and third years. The six vocational groups are: (1) The Preaching Ministry and Pastoral Service; (2) Foreign Missionary Service; (3) Religious Education in Church and School; (4) Christian Service in the Community; (5) Religious Leadership in Colleges; and (6) Teaching and Research in Religion.

Senator Ralph Flanders (R., Vt.) has introduced an amendment to the Constitution in the Senate which would declare that the United States "recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ." The text of the proposed amendment is as follows: "Section 1. This nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Savior and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God. Section 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom or freedom of speech and press or of peaceful assemblage. Section 3. Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper to

provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

The new version of the Old Testament authorized by the International Council of Religious Education is nearing completion. The first five books of the Old Testament are going to press now. By the end of summer the entire Old Testament will be in the hands of the printers. The distribution of the new version will begin September 30, 1952.

The Louis M. Rabinowitz Institute for research in rabbinics is getting ready to publish accurate texts of ancient rabbinic works. Dr. Louis Finkelstein says that project will take ten years and will cost \$250,000 to \$300,000. According to present plans nine books, including the Mishnah and its related texts, will be published. To make scientific editions possible, photographs of original manuscripts were made in the libraries of the British Museum, English universities, the Vatican, and the state libraries of Berlin and Vienna. Included in the investigation will be manuscripts in Geniza, a room in an ancient synagog in Cairo where lost Hebrew documents were stored for centuries until discovered by Dr. Solomon Schechter, a noted Jewish scholar.

The McCollum Decision of the United States Supreme Court dealt weekday religious education a serious blow two years ago. However, Dr. Erwin L. Shaver of Chicago said in his annual report to the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches that weekday religious education has returned strongly in forty States. More than 2,250,000 children are sharing in the benefits of weekday religious programs. In his estimation the comeback is definite, especially in a half dozen States where the relinquishing of programs had been heaviest. (See p. 366.)

Dr. Truman B. Douglass of New York made a strong plea for Christian education in an address before the first meeting of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches. He based his plea on the fact that public education toward religion has shifted to a neutrality very close to indifference and so amounts to practical atheism.

Chinese Communists are opposing the missionary movement in China on the ground that it is guilty of "cultural aggression." Writing from Hong Kong, Dr. Baker James Cauthen, secretary of the Southern

Baptist Foreign Mission Board, said the Communists see missionary work as a bond of good will between America and the people of China and therefore they are trying to break down this bond by accusing the missionaries of "cultural aggression."

The Sudan legislature has passed a law giving Moslem missionaries permission to work in the South Sudan under the same conditions applying to Christian missionaries. In addition to this law, the legislature passed an additional law which puts a heavy burden on Christian mission schools by making Arabic the official language of the whole of tribal Sudan. Missionaries report that it is extremely difficult to find Arabic-speaking Christians who can undertake this extra language work.

The Iowa Senate Schools Committee is considering a bill which would broaden religious teaching in Iowa public schools. Under the terms of the bill, teachers in all schools would be permitted to "teach the philosophy of Christianity," say the Lord's Prayer, read and discuss the Bible as it is recorded in the Old and New Testaments. The bill also gives children in public schools the privilege of reading and discussing Holy Scripture, and permitting schools to discuss and explain the Ten Commandments.

Two South Korean churchmen, Dr. Hyungki J. Lew, Methodist, and the Rev. Kyung-Chik Han, Presbyterian, have brought some bloody reports to the United States about Communist activity against church people in their homeland. According to their report the United Nations forces found about 75% of all clergymen killed or taken captive when they crossed the 38th parallel last September. They also discovered that in Sunchun more than forty church elders and deacons had been rounded up in a valley and shot down by the Communists. They also said that in Shinchun, Communist troops had stormed into a Presbyterian church during services and shot and killed in cold blood many of the worshippers and the church pastor with machine guns.

The evangelical community of Katerini, the largest Protestant constituency in Greece, was busy building the first Protestant school in Greece. When the school was almost finished, the Greek Ministry of Education and Religion informed Dr. G. A. Hadjiantoniou, moderator of the Greek Evangelical Church, that "a permit for the operation of an evangelical school cannot be granted, as no law provides for the separate operation of schools by each of the existing religious minorities in Greece."

## BOOK REVIEW

*All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.*

**THE NEW GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By George Ricker Berry, Ph. D., of the University of Chicago and Colgate University. Wilcox & Follett Company, Chicago, 1948. 137 pages, 6×9½. \$2.00.

**THE ANALYTICAL GREEK LEXICON:** Consisting of an alphabetical arrangement of every occurring inflection of every word contained in the Greek New Testament Scriptures with a grammatical analysis of each word and lexicographical illustration of the meanings. A complete series of paradigms with grammatical remarks and explanations. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers; London: Samuel Baxter and Sons, Ltd. 444 pages, 7½×10. \$4.00.

As to the book by Berry, the title is misleading. It was correct in 1897 when the book was first issued. As far as I can see, the present edition is a reprint of the work as published in the nineteenth century. It is a volume of convenient size, which may serve the beginner who is interested in the English equivalent of the Greek word and nothing else. The section on synonyms of the New Testament, based chiefly on Trench's famous work, is valuable in spite of the lapse of years.

*The Analytical Greek Lexicon* is likewise a work which can well serve a beginner. Its condensed grammar section will be found useful. In the lexical, the chief part of the work, the alphabetical list contains separate entries of the verb forms that occur in the New Testament. Thus when a reader of the Greek N. T. comes, let us say, upon the form *klōomen*, he will find it listed separately and described as first pers. pl. pres. ind. act. of *klaoo*. Similarly the various cases of the nouns are included. As our generation is becoming weaker, it may need crutches of this sort.

W. ARNDT

**BERKELEY VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM THE ORIGINAL GREEK VERSION WITH BRIEF FOOTNOTES.** By Gerrit Verkuyl, Ph. D., D. D., a New Testament Fellow of Princeton. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids 2, Mich. 672 pages, 4×5½. \$2.50.

It is raining — New Testament translations. The British Revised Version of 1881 was followed in 1901 by the American Revised Version; about the same time appeared the Twentieth Century New Testament; in 1902 came Weymouth's translation; Moffatt's appeared in 1913, in 1923 Goodspeed's, the same year Ballantine's, Mrs. Montgomery's in 1924, etc.

Verkuy's rendering, now before us in the fifth edition, first was published in 1945. Dr. Verkuy is a Presbyterian who has given much time to young people's work. The translation is readable and live. Where I have examined it, it renders the Greek correctly. The notes, while usually helpful, cannot always be endorsed. On 1 Pet. 3:19 the author says, "Enokai, possibly referring to Enoch as preaching to the antediluvians; else, Christ preaching to them through Noah. If the slain Christ were meant, all souls in hell would have been included." That *Enokai* should here be connected with the name Enoch must be considered unfortunate. The idea that the preaching of Christ, as the *logos asarkos*, through Noah is referred to here by Peter was, it will be recalled, the opinion of St. Augustine. — On account of the discussions going on in our own midst I insert here without comment Verkuy's rendering of Rom. 16:17-18. "But I warn you, brothers, to keep an eye on those who cause splits and obstacles, quite out of harmony with the doctrine you have been taught, and to keep away from them. For people of that type do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by means of ingratiating talk and flattery they deceive the minds of the unsuspecting."

W. ARNDT

**YOUR BIBLE AND YOU.** By Charles R. Erdman, Prof. emer. of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. The John C. Winston Co., Philadelphia-Toronto. 179 pages, 6×9. \$2.50.

To read the Bible with profit, it is useful that one be given a brief introduction to the various sacred books submitting information on the author and the purpose of each. The excellent book here reviewed is designed to furnish such introductions. After several chapters of a general nature, having these headings: The Book of Life; The Word of God; English Versions; Aids in Reading; a Divine Unity, the individual books are briefly discussed in the sequence in which they are found in the King James Version. Dr. Erdman, whose present status is pointed to in the title, is master of a terse, pithy, and yet pleasant style, and in a few well-chosen sentences he gives the reader important hints on the Biblical book to be studied. The chapters dealing with the separate books are each about two pages long. Questions of chronology and geography are not given much space; the author's aim rather is to sketch the chief thoughts of the sacred writer so that attention can be focused on them. It is the reviewer's opinion that Dr. Erdman has achieved his purpose in an eminent degree. In addition to its other good qualities, the book breathes a reverent spirit; it treats the Bible throughout as the Word of God, written by divine inspiration.

In the chapter on Daniel the last sentence (p. 91) seemingly has a millennial implication. Likewise in the discussion of Romans 9—11 a chiliastic thought has crept in. The sentence (p. 133): "The rejection of Israel is not complete or final; even now some Jews are being saved, and in the future the nation will unite with the Gentiles in accepting



Christ," should be changed to read somewhat like this: "The rejection of Israel is not complete or final; even now some Jews are being saved, and ultimately every member of the 'true Israel' will unite with the elect among the Gentiles in accepting Christ."

W. ARNDT

**THE LORD OF GLORY.** A Study of the Designations of Our Lord in the New Testament with Especial Reference to His Deity. By Benjamin B. Warfield. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 332 pages,  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ . \$3.50.

This is a reprint from the plates of the American Tract Society and was first published in 1907. This volume may well be considered as a companion volume to the recent volume of Warfield's writings published under the title *The Person and Work of Christ*. In this study Warfield investigates some 150 designations given to our Lord in the New Testament books. His interest is primarily apologetic against the various trends at the turn of the century which questioned and denied the deity of our Lord. Warfield treats the designations of our Lord more from the viewpoint of Christ's Person than of His work. The treatise is on the same high scholarly level as all of Warfield's writings.

F. E. MAYER

**GESCHICHTE DER NEUERN EVANGELISCHEN THEOLOGIE** im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europaischen Denkens. 6. bis 9. Lieferung. Von Emanuel Hirsch. C. Bertelsmann Verlag, Guetersloh. 80 pages, each,  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ . DM. 3.50 per Lieferung. Subscription price, DM. 3.15.

This monumental work, of which nine *Lieferungen* of 80 pages each have now appeared, was discussed in this journal last year, p. 556. The sixth and seventh *Lieferung* are the first installment of Volume II under the title *Die neuen philosophischen und theologischen Anfaenge in Deutschland*. The eighth and ninth *Lieferung* discuss the theology of Jakob Boehme and its influence on later Pietistic and spiritualistic trends.

F. E. MAYER

**POSITIVE PROTESTANTISM.** An Interpretation of the Gospel. By Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., Ph.D. 147 pages,  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ . Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1950. \$2.50.

For a long time the need has existed for a brief presentation of the essentials of Protestantism in a form readily understandable to the non-theological reader. Professor Kerr, chairman of the Department of Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, is well suited for the production of such a book, not only because of his experience in pastoral work and in teaching, but also because of his previous literary efforts in Reformation theology.

The present work is, as its title indicates, an attempt to present the "positive" features of Protestantism. The term "Protestantism" has come to connote primarily a negative movement opposed to Roman Catholicism,

and Professor Kerr succeeds in pointing out that Protestantism also has a positive content. This content he sees in an interpretation of the Christian Gospel, from which and from which alone Protestantism derives its reason for existence.

In keeping with this conviction Professor Kerr insists that "unity must be the result of a common faith" (p. 25); repeatedly his work points to the need for unity in faith as the basis for any reunion of the Protestant churches. The book is well written and can easily be read even by one who has not been initiated into the charmed circle of the theologians. Throughout Professor Kerr keeps a basically Biblical orientation, which helps to make the book interesting as well as convincing.

As was perhaps inevitable in so brief a discussion, Professor Kerr's analysis of Protestantism tends at times to be superficial and to minimize problems for the sake of clarification. Although he is deeply concerned that Protestantism articulate an adequate doctrine of the Church (pp. 132 to 139), he does not face up adequately to the development of the Church between the Apostolic Age and the Reformation (pp. 39—49). In his discussion of Protestantism he seems to this reviewer to minimize some of the difficult problems involved in defining Protestantism in view of the confused denominational situation. Is there such a thing as Protestantism? It will not do to answer such a question with a passing criticism of "confessionalism" (p. 30). "Confessionalism" may be good or bad, Protestant or non-Protestant; but no one can ignore the historic confessions of the evangelical churches in his effort to define Protestantism.

As such an effort, however, Professor Kerr's discussion merits serious and careful attention. Though it cannot be called profound in any sense, it is certainly stimulating and worth while.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

FRAGEN UM DEN BEGRIFF DER NATUERLICHEN THEOLOGIE. Von Rudolf Hermann. 53 pages, 6½×9½. C. Bertelsmann Verlag, Guetersloh. 1950.

The purpose of this brief essay is to examine a number of problems connected with natural theology, especially as these problems have been raised by the controversy between Emil Brunner and Karl Barth and complicated by the publication of Barth's enigmatic "Christengemeinde und Buergergemeinde" (p. 51).

It is the author's concern, on the one hand, to avoid the excesses which have been associated with the Thomist doctrine of "analogy of being," and yet, on the other hand, properly to evaluate that relation between the Creator and the creature which continues even after and in spite of sin. This latter he does on the basis of Acts 14:17, a seriously neglected text in current discussions of natural knowledge (pp. 18—21).

Unfortunately, the author's presentation is so brief as to be tantalizing, but never satisfying. But his title indicates his desire to raise certain "Fragen," not to answer them. In this he has succeeded.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

**GREAT SHORTER WORKS OF PASCAL.** Translated with an Introduction by Emile Cailliet and John C. Blankenagel. The Westminster Press. Philadelphia. 231 pages. \$4.50.

To the church history student, Pascal is known chiefly as the author of the *Provincial Letters*, which played so great a role in that attempt to reform the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and lead the clergy of France away from Jesuit Pelagianism and back to Augustine's doctrine of grace, the Jansenist movement. To others he is perhaps better known as a mathematician of genius and a great inventor. The purpose in offering the *Great Shorter Works*, the editors say, is "to make essential classical Pascalian literature, other than the *Provincial Letters* and the *Pensées*, available to discriminating readers who might find the original texts difficult and discouraging." Forty-five letters are presented, written during the intensely active period of his life, from the age of 20 to his death at age of 38. It is difficult to see why some of these letters were included in this collection (despite the valuable introduction); most of them do "reflect the variety of Pascal's interests. For this reason, among others, they are of value, not only to those who are interested in Christianity, but also to those who are interested in physics, or mathematics, or philosophy." Hence the book will help to clarify the picture of the man who not only gave to the world "many tangible legacies, including the calculating machine, the barometer, the hydraulic press, and the omnibus," but who (and this stands highest to all who love true Christianity) promoted and defended that tragic movement, the defeat of which, strengthening Jesuitism in its vicious activity and cementing the bonds between the Church of France and the already hated French government, did so much toward turning the agents of the French Revolution against Christianity and against all religion.

THEO. HOYER

**THE LUTHERAN TRAIL.** A History of the Synodical Conference Lutheran Churches in Northern Illinois. By Louis J. Schwartzkopf. 698 pages, 8½×6. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1950. \$3.50 net, plus postage (shipping weight, 3 lbs.).

The purpose of this compendious volume by Pastor Schwartzkopf is to provide the reader with authoritative information about a representative group of Synodical Conference congregations. The work extends over the entire northern part of the State of Illinois and brings us brief histories of the Synodical Conference congregations in that area—250 in all.

Such a work as this is not in the professional sense history, since it is concerned principally with a chronicling of events, personalities, buildings, etc. But it is most certainly the stuff of which history is made and, as such, of primary usefulness for the future historian. The history of the Christian Church is not only the history of its theologians and officials, but pre-eminently the history of its people. Too often in the past the

history of various groups, like the Missouri Synod, has restricted itself to the official actions of those groups and has ignored the religious life of the people themselves.

Pastor Schwartzkopf has rendered our Church a great service in making these materials available. It is to be hoped that other areas of our Church will follow suit, so that at some future date some future historian may write the history of the Missouri Synod—not only of its conventions, theologians, and officers, but of its congregations and people.

Several illustrations and many quotations help to enliven Pastor Schwartzkopf's sprightly narrative and to make it very interesting reading.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

**AN OUTLINE OF NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS.** By Lindsay Dewar. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, c. 1949. 280 pages,  $5\frac{1}{8} \times 7\frac{3}{8}$ . \$3.00.

Canon Dewar herewith presents a summary of the passages of the New Testament which deal with behavior. As that, the book is remarkably complete and useful. Some of the author's relationships are stimulating. The book is useful in emphasizing that the authors of the New Testament were interested in virtues, in the practical behavior of various classes of believers. On the other hand the book fails to describe adequately the redemption of Jesus Christ as the source of the Holy Spirit and of love. The author's construction of the concepts of "commandment" and "teaching" need improvement in the light of the over-all significance of the Redemption. Particularly Titus comes short in his treatment.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

**TAKE A SECOND LOOK AT YOURSELF.** By John Homer Miller. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville, c. 1950. 187 pages,  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ . \$2.00.

The author is pastor of a Congregational church in Springfield, Mass. His book is one of many current at the moment on the problems of personality under fear. The author writes engagingly and has a wealth of literary allusion at his disposal. With the exception of one line on page 96, this reviewer was unable to find an explicitly Christian power for the overcoming of fear or the rebuilding of the structure of the mind which the author envisages.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

**THE CHURCH AND HEALING.** By Carl J. Scherzer. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. 272 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ . \$4.00.

This volume should be of special value to all who have a particular interest in the subject of healing. Beginning with the miraculous cures of the sick as recorded in the New Testament, it gives a comprehensive overview of the services rendered to the sick in Apostolic, medieval, and Reformation days down to the present. Among the subjects discussed are: The work of deacons and deaconesses in the Early Church, medieval medical practice, Catholic religious orders, modern nursing orders and church

hospitals, modern healing cults, the Emmanuel movement, medical missions, and current hospital chaplaincy and clinical training programs. Naturally, we cannot vouch for the authenticity of the author's findings nor for all of the views which he expresses, but he who would orientate himself on the specific ministry to the sick throughout the New Testament era will find this a handy reference work. A bibliography of more than one hundred volumes covering the various phases of this subject is appended. The price seems a bit high.

O. E. SOHN

FIFTY DEVOTIONAL SERVICES. First series. By Paul N. Elbin, Ph.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1950. 255 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ . \$2.50.

The services included in this volume were prepared by the president of West Liberty State College, West Liberty, W. Va. They are intended largely for churches, schools, and colleges; each includes a prelude, an invocation, suggested hymns, responsive readings, a central thought, and a prayer. The author disapproves of the use of inferior means of worship, and though he does not employ the historically great liturgies of the Christian Church, the services he has prepared are orderly, logical, and well integrated. He uses no less than 159 quotations, prayers, and readings, in addition to many quotations from the Bible. From the theological point of view, one must often disagree with the author, e. g., when he says: "Jesus' death upon the cross was not enough; there must be more crosses raised before the world can be redeemed" (p. 175). Too many services slight our Savior and His blessed Gospel, particularly in the fore part of the book. He also repeats certain hymns too often, and many of the hymns he recommends are not known to our people. Like much other devotional literature of our day, the present volume indicates clearly that a strong reaction against revivalistic services and Gospel hymns is coursing its way through American Protestantism; services and worship materials of this type have done great harm to the worship life and experience of many churches. Dr. Elbin's book was written to help remedy this unfortunate situation.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

RIGHT HERE, RIGHT NOW. By Margaret T. Applegarth. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1950. 269 pages,  $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ . \$2.75.

Miss Applegarth's book contains twenty-eight complete worship programs. In these, dramatic incidents and stories are presented in word pictures which are to "enrich the understanding and deepen devotion at the same time." While some are built around brief biographies of Christian people in varied times and situations, others seek to interpret chapters of the Bible through dramatic means, and still others draw parallels between trials of ancient days and those of our own day. All follow a similar pattern and usually include a call to worship, hymns, prayers, and readings in collect or antiphonal form. Miss Applegarth is clearly not a novice at

preparing materials of this kind. She knows how to create and sustain interest, combines unity with variety, and she carefully avoids what is commonplace, cheap, and vulgar. In her attempts to be ecumenical the author often refuses to become specific; her book was prepared to accommodate people of divergent religious views. While treating the passage: "Father, I pray that they may all be one, as Thou and I are one," she speaks disparagingly of those who dare read into this passage the added sentiment: "For our own creed only" (p. 25). Our pastors, teachers, and other youth leaders would have to do much revising and deleting before using most of the materials here presented. While these worship programs may hardly be said to be pointless, they are not as Christ-centered as we have a right to expect; what, after all, is worship and what does it accomplish if Christ is not its very Center and Core? A worship program, too, should have the welfare of the human soul in mind. While other wholesome means definitely have their place and purpose in the life of the human being, they cannot do what only the Gospel of Jesus Christ can do. This, we believe, should be accentuated in a worship program; failing to do so is succumbing to the most unfortunate weakness of our age and time.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:*

CONCORDIA BIBLE TEACHER. Vol. XII, No. 3. CONCORDIA BIBLE STUDENT. Vol. XL, No. 3. The History of Israel, Part II. April—June, 1951. Edited by Rev. John M. Weidenschilling, S. T. D., Auspices of the Board for Parish Education, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. \$1.00 and 65 cents per annum, respectively.

PORTALS OF PRAYER. Daily Devotions No. 104. By Various Authors. April 15—June 5, 1951. 10 cents per copy.

ANDACHTSBUECHLEIN No. 104. Das Wort vom Kreuz im christlichen Leben. 15. April bis zum 5. Juni 1951. By Carl Gieseler. 10 cents per copy.



W

in  
is  
he  
n-  
e:  
he  
ed  
nd  
re  
ns  
ve  
c-  
n,  
er  
of  
an  
il-  
ge

E  
e,  
he  
d.

rs.

en  
ts